

**WHEN ON HIGH YAHWEH REIGNED:
TRANSLATING YAHWEH'S KINGSHIP IN ANCIENT ISRAEL**

by

Shawn W. Flynn

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Shawn W. Flynn 2012

When on High Yahweh Reigned: Translating Yahweh's Kingship in Ancient Israel

Shawn W. Flynn

Doctor of Philosophy

Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations
University of Toronto

2012

This dissertation identifies two distinct stages of YHWH's kingship in ancient Israel: an earlier warrior king with a limited sphere of geographic influence, and a later, Judahite creator king with universal power and absolute rule. After identifying these stages, this dissertation proposes the historical context in which the change to YHWH's kingship occurred. Articulating this change is informed by the anthropological method of cultural translation and studied via a suitable historical analogue: the change in Marduk's kingship and the external pressures that lead to the expression of his universal kingship in the Enuma Elish. The Babylonian changes to Marduk's kingship form a suitable analogy to articulate the changes to YHWH's kingship in the Levant. Therefore Judahite scribes suppressed the early warrior vision of YHWH's kingship and promoted a more sustainable vision of a creator and universal king in order to combat the increasing threat of Neo-Assyrian imperialism begun under the reign of Tiglath-pileser III.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Charting the Kingship of YHWH

Introduction	1
Scholarly Ambiguity in Characterizing YHWH's Kingship	3
A Brief History of Scholarship	8
Scholarship Since Mowinckel	12
The Backgrounds of Israelite Divinity	17
The Absence of the Warrior Motif in the Psalms of YHWH's Kingship	27

Chapter Two: Stages of YHWH's Kingship in Ancient Israel 33

Part I: The Psalms of YHWH's Kingship	34
The Sphere of YHWH's Kingship in Psalms 93, 95-99	38
Transition in the YHWH Kingship Psalms	43
Summary of the YHWH Kingship Psalms	46
Part II: The Corpus of YHWH's Early Kingship	47
The Song of the Sea	47
Parallelism	50
Repetition	52
Sounds	52
Narrative Progression and Structure	54
Structural Analysis and its Relevance for Verse 18	56
Summary of Exodus 15	57
Exodus 15 and Psalm 93: Differences in YHWH's Kingship	57
The Absence of a Creation Motif in Exodus 15	60
Summary: The Elements of YHWH's Kingship in Exodus 15	62
Deuteronomy 33:5	64
Summary	68
Numbers 23:21	69
Summary	75
Psalm 29: Establishing Differences From Earlier and Later Expressions of YHWH's Kingship	75
Conclusions: Stages of YHWH's Kingship	82

Chapter Three: Cultural Translation as Method 84

Cultural Translation in Israelite Religion	85
Limitations to Israelite Religion's Use of Cultural Translation	86

Cultural Translation and its Anthropological Roots	89
Cultural Translation and Amitav Ghosh	93
Ghosh and Contributions to Cultural Translation	95
Cultural Translation and Its Further Use for Israelite Religion	100
Chapter Four: The Origins of New Israelite Expressions for YHWH's Kingship	105
Introduction	105
The <i>Enūma eliš</i>	106
The Uniqueness in the <i>Enūma eliš</i> and Coherence	108
Resonance of the <i>Enūma eliš</i>	112
The Problem of Dating and Motivations for Marduk's New Expression	115
Lambert's Dating	119
Kassite Rule and Lambert's Date of the <i>Enūma eliš</i>	122
Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I and Assyrian Threats to Marduk	126
The <i>Enūma eliš</i> and The Epic of Tukulti Ninurta	130
Summary	138
Chapter Five: The Context and Motivations of YHWH's New Kingship	140
Part I: Parallel Expansion:	
The Similar Histories of Marduk's and YHWH's Kingships	140
Conglomerate Traditions	144
A Close Reading of the <i>Enūma eliš</i> and the YHWH Kingship Psalms	147
Universal and Absolute Kingships	148
Divine Nature	150
The Eternal Word	155
Creation	158
Part II: Divergences in Translation: Making Marduk's Divinity Coherent in Judah	160
The Nature of Worship	160
The Warrior Tradition in the Psalms of YHWH's Kingship	163
Part III: Selecting an Appropriate Context for the Change of YHWH's Kingship	167
The Nature of Neo-Assyrian Imperialism under Tiglath-pileser III	174
Neo-Assyrian Imperialism and the Psalms as Response	177
Economic Policy	178
Cultural Policy	180
Religious Policy	184
Universalism as Response	191
The Absence of a Warrior Tradition as Response	192
Part IV: Jerusalemite Prophets of the Neo-Assyrian Period	193

First-Isaiah	194
Universalism	195
The Warrior Tradition	198
Summary	202
Chapter Six: Conclusion	204
Bibliography	208

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABH	Archaic Biblical Hebrew
ATDE	Altes Testament Deutsch Ergänzungsreihe
<i>AfO</i>	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AKA	The Annals of the Kings of Assyria
ANE	Ancient Near East
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
AR	<i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</i>
AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BCAW	Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World
BCSMS	<i>Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies</i>
BETL	<i>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium</i>
<i>BibOr</i>	<i>Biblica et orientale</i>
BM	British Museum
<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CAD	Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CSMSB	<i>Canadian Society of Mesopotamian Studies Bulletin</i>
CH	Code of Hammurabi
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
COS	Context of Scripture
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
CT	Cuneiform Texts
CT	Cultural Translation
CTA	<i>Corpus des texts cunéiforms alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939. Edited by A. Herdner. Mission de Ras Shamra 10. Paris, 1963</i>
DDD	Dictionary of Deities and Demons
ED	Early Dynastic
EE	<i>Enūma eliš</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
ETMS	Evangelical Theological Monograph Series
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FAR	Forschungen zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HBS	Herders Biblische Studien
HdO	Handbook of Oriental Studies
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HS	Hebrew Studies

HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IRT	<i>Issues in Religion and Theology</i>
ISJ	Institute of Jewish Studies
JAAS	<i>Journal of the Assyrian Academic Society</i>
JANER	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Religion</i>
JAR	<i>Journal of Anthropological Research</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JCL	<i>Journal of Commonwealth Literature</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
KAR	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts</i>
KTU	Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit. Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmart.n. AOAT 24/1. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976. 2d enlarged ed. of KTU: The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places. Edited by M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmart.n. Münster, 1995 (= CTU)
LB	Late Babylonian
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LIC	<i>Language and Intercultural Communication</i>
LRB	<i>London Review of Books</i>
MB	Middle Babylonian
NABU	<i>Nouvelles assyriologiques breves et utilitaires</i>
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OB	Old Babylonian period
OBO	<i>Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis</i>
OIS	<i>Oriental Institute Studies</i>
OLP	<i>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</i>
OTE	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PSPSH	Poznan Studies in the Philosophy of Sciences and the Humanities
PT	<i>Postcolonial Text</i>
PTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
RA	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
RAI	Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
RIA	Reallexikon der Assyriologie. Edited by Erich Ebeling et al. Berlin, 1928–
RIMA	Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia
SAAB	<i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i>
SAACT	<i>State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts</i>

SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Studies in Biblical Literature Dissertation Series.
SBLABS	Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources in Biblical Studies
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings of the Ancient World
SB	Standard Babylonian
SBH	Standard Biblical Hebrew
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SSEA	Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities
SR	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
SS	<i>Subaltern Studies</i>
ST	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
SO	<i>Studia Orientalia</i>
ThZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
TLS	<i>Times Literary Supplement</i>
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
UBC I	Mark S. Smith, <i>The Ugaritic Baal Cycle</i> Vol I
UBC II	Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, <i>The Ugaritic Baal Cycle</i> Vol II
UF	<i>Ugarit Forschungen</i>
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
YOS	Yale Oriental Series
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Chapter One: Charting the Kingship of YHWH

Introduction

The impact of the Neo-Assyrian period on Israelite religion is a contested topic with deeply different views. An early period of scholarship suggested that Assyrian imperialism had a minimal impact on Israel.¹ Cogan calls attention to Assyrian policies that upheld the local cult: at times Assyrian rhetoric claimed that the god of the conquered nation had abandoned his host nation to join the victors, that the Assyrian officials accepted oaths from new vassals, and that the Assyrians were involved in the restoration of local cults. For Cogan, these were not direct challenges to local religion and especially not forced Assyrian religious expressions on the local cult. In contrast, Spieckermann and, more extensively, Holloway, envision a more oppressive Assyrian presence that Israel and Judah reacted to in significant ways.² Considering these two positions, Machinist has summarized that the former group “have made it clear that the imperial impact on the culture and religion of its subjects more often worked subtly and indirectly than broadly and forcibly.”³ This study’s approach is that, while Cogan has argued against a forcible Assyrian influence, Holloway has provided more space in which to understand how subtle and indirect influence operated.

¹ Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (SBLMS 19; Montana: Scholars Press, 1974). Also see the work of John W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians* (SBTS 26; London: SCM Press, 1973). These scholars reacted to earlier work that suggested Assyrian rulers forced images of the king and god on their vassal states. For this position see Albert T. Olmsted, *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria, 722-705 B.C.* (New York: H. Holt, 1908), 171.

² Hermann Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidzeit* (FRLANT 129; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); Steven W. Holloway, *Aššur is King! Aššur is King!: Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (CHANE 10; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

³ Peter Machinist, “Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from Second Isaiah,” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (ed. W. G. Dever and S. Gitin; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 237.

The purpose of this study is threefold: to classify stages of YHWH's kingship in Israel, identify the distinct features of YHWH's kingship at those different stages, and then offer a probable motivation and context for the change that occurred in YHWH's kingship. Informed by the developments to Marduk's kingship in Babylon as suitable parallels for the new Israelite expression, this study contextualizes the change in YHWH's kingship as a Judahite response to the policies of Neo-Assyrian imperialism begun under the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.). The Psalms of YHWH's kingship (Pss 47, 93, 95-99) make this process evident in their significant developments to the metaphor of YHWH's kingship relative to an early corpus of texts (Exod 15:1-18, Num 23, Deut 33:5 and Ps 29). These developments were in response to the military, religious and political pressures of Neo-Assyrian imperialism.

In establishing this thesis, there are a variety of time periods and texts to navigate. The first step, undertaken in chapter 2, is establishing that a significant change in YHWH's divinity has occurred. This raises the question of why such change was needed. The second step, conducted in chapter 3, identifies and explores an appropriate method, cultural translation, which clarifies the motivations for change to religious expressions. This same method helps understand how Israelite scribes may have borrowed and adapted the expressions of divinity that were around them and applied them to the changes in YHWH's kingship. The third step, in chapter 4, uses the methodological insights of chapter 3 to explore an historical analogue to changes in YHWH's kingship. This analogue shows Babylon also experienced Assyrian imperialism under Tukulti-Ninurta I and made significant changes to its own expressions of divine kingship through a unique change in Marduk's divinity. This change provides an analogue for exploring

the similar change in YHWH's kingship. The final step in chapter 5 studies specific parallels between the new form of YHWH's kingship in Judah and Marduk's kingship in Babylon. Drawing on the detailed readings of YHWH's and Marduk's kingships in chapters 2 and 4, the analysis in chapter 5 argues that the pressure of Assyrian imperialism that produced a shift in Marduk's status to sole king in the *Enūma eliš*, is similar to the shift in YHWH's status as sole king in the kingship Psalms. Finally, chapter 5 argues the most appropriate context for the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, and thus the change in YHWH's divinity, is a Jerusalemite/Judahite context in response to Neo-Assyrian imperialism begun under Tiglath-pileser III. This context is solidified by correspondences between YHWH's new kingship with both the policies of Tiglath-pileser III and the similar rhetoric of early Jerusalemite prophets responding to the same Neo-Assyrian imperialism.

Scholarly Ambiguity in Characterizing YHWH's Kingship

In Judg 8:22-23 the Israelites approach Gideon and ask him to rule over them. Gideon's response is that neither he, nor his sons will rule over Israel because only YHWH can rule over them (here מֶלֶךְ not מֹשֵׁל). If this text assumes YHWH's kingship, it offers no indication of what that metaphor means. What does it mean for Israel to reify YHWH through the metaphor of kingship? When did this concept become part of Israel's divine expression? Was it informed by any ancient near Eastern expressions of other divine kings? How was the Israelite concept expressed differently at particular points in history or in different geographical locations? How did it change and develop in light of a centralized temple and the Jerusalemite expression of kingship in the Psalms? Finally, if

there are differences in the expressions of YHWH's kingship, how did those differences develop?

Answering these questions faces an immediate difficulty since first, discussions of YHWH's kingship are not prevalent in current scholarship; second, a large portion of scholarship dedicated to the analysis of YHWH's kingship has explained the expression more in terms of continuity than difference. Current and past scholarship constructs YHWH as the divine-warrior king who echoes the ANE cosmic myth of divine battle with the forces of chaos, establishes a universal kingship, and is simultaneously a creator deity.⁴ In this construction, scholars look to the enthronement Psalms that demonstrate this kingship was celebrated annually at a New Year festival—echoing the *akītu* festival in Mesopotamia—since YHWH is the warrior-creator king who establishes absolute and universal kingship by his victory over chaos. This construction is clearly an aspect of YHWH's kingship in the HB. Yet can all expressions of YHWH's kingship be assessed through the lens of a warrior deity? The following chapter will demonstrate that this monarchic construction is the singular lens through which all YHWH kingship passages have been read.

While the above construction creates scholarly expectations of the texts meanings, at times, the accepted constructions of YHWH's kingship do not correspond with the details of the text. For example, in his commentary on Deuteronomy, Nelson says of Deut 33:5 (וַיֵּהִי בִישׁרוּן מֶלֶךְ): “emerging as king ‘in Jeshurun’ seems like an odd thing to say of

⁴ Generally, scholars assume YHWH's kingship entails a divine cosmic battle. YHWH wins kingship much like Marduk does over Tiamat or Baal wins kingship over the sea god Yamm. See, Carola J.L. Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat in the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 1986). For a discussion of this tradition, its use in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, and parallels in Babylon (especially with regards to Ps 93) see, Edward Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël* (Paleis der Academiën: Brussels, 1968), 123-32.

a universal, divine kingship.”⁵ Nelson assumes a universal kingship in a text that limits kingship to a geographic locale.

In addition to assuming a universal kingship in localizing contexts, scholars also assume that YHWH’s kingship always echoes the motif of the cosmic battle and the divine warrior. Clearly, this tradition is known to Israel in some of its earliest poetry (Deut 33:2-3; Exod 15:1-18; Ps 29; Hab 3). But why assume it is the same way in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship?

In his Psalms commentary, Clifford refers multiple times to the tradition of the divine warrior echoed in those Psalms. Regarding Ps 97 he states: “As verse 10 makes clear, the proclamation of the Lord as king implies that the victory established the world . . . the Lord “will judge” (i.e., rule) the world in virtue of the kingship won by that victory.”⁶ In other cases Clifford describes Ps 93:3-4 as the cosmic battle between the sea and YHWH, claims that Ps 95 presumes this cosmic combat myth, and states that Ps 97:2-7 reflects YHWH’s victory over the storm.⁷ Clifford is not unique in seeing echoes of warrior kingship myths in these texts, nor is he incorrect to expect them.

The problem is that Ps 97, and the majority of these YHWH kingship Psalms, do not reference the warrior tradition as explicitly as other texts of YHWH’s kingship like Exod 15:1-18. In the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship, explicit references to the mythological tradition of the cosmic battle are lacking; the references to YHWH’s victories are limited. Psalm 97:3 refers to fire that defeats YHWH’s foes and Ps 98:2

⁵ Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 389.

⁶ Richard J. Clifford, *Psalms 73-150* (AOTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), 117, 120, 122. In these discussions Clifford refers his readers back to his introduction in which he discusses the motif of the divine warrior winning the battle over the forces of chaos. This study does not disagree with the presence of that tradition in the ANE or in the biblical material. The only question is whether we can assume that tradition in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship (Pss 93, 95-99).

⁷ Clifford, *Psalms 73-150*, 110, 117.

refers to a victory, but neither specifies what these entail. Only Ps 98:1 refers to the hand of YHWH, a phrase typical of the warrior tradition in Israel and the ANE. Yet as we will see in chapters 2 and 5, that reference is stripped of its warrior language in favour of a new vision of kingship. In determining the forms of YHWH's kingship at different stages in the Israelite expression, we can ask whether the warrior tradition is as strongly emphasized in these Psalms as we expect, or whether the limited references are overshadowed by a different emphasis?

More recently, scholars have recognized that the divine warrior features are not as prevalent in all texts of YHWH's kingship. In discussing this primary motif of YHWH as the warrior king, Tanner analyzes Pss 96-99 expecting to find that theme. Yet Tanner asks: "How can two motifs that are essential to the Marduk and Baal epics of kingship be missing from the Yahweh enthronement Psalms? Or are they indeed missing?"⁸ Tanner goes on to cite the monotheistic perspective of the text as a possible reason for the warrior language being silenced. Yet there is another possibility; the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are moving away from their past Israelite expression to a new expression of YHWH's kingship.⁹ There is no doubt that the warrior tradition is known to the YHWH

⁸ Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality* (SBL 26; New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 113.

⁹ Thanks to Mark Smith's work on early forms of YHWHism, it is commonly held that monotheism is a late development in Israelite religion. See, Mark S. Smith *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). Various scholars of Israelite religion have convincingly demonstrated that YHWH's divinity is an evolutionary one that grows in significance over time. A few challenges to this idea of late monotheism have been offered, but have not significantly explained how texts like Deut 32:8-9 or Psalm 82 fit into their analyses. Assmann and Hendel have argued for an early monotheism; Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). Others have argued for an early monotheism from inscriptional evidence. See, Jeffery H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in Light of Hebrew Inscriptions* (HSS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

kingship Psalms, yet it is not merely a repetition of that tradition as it exists in early Hebrew poetry.

Other examples show that scholarship to date has a static understanding of YHWH's kingship. Zenger argues that Ps 29 demonstrates YHWH's world domination and thus the universal sphere of his kingship.¹⁰ Yet in this case, as we will see, various aspects of Ps 29 indicate a more limited kingship in line with the earlier texts. The majority of scholars believe Ps 29 is much earlier than the YHWH kingship Psalms of the Jerusalem temple in which a universal expression would have been more common. We can also consider Russell, whose analysis of Exod 15 approaches the text with the expectation of YHWH's universal kingship that, for him, implies YHWH is omniscient.¹¹ Given the agreed early date of the Song of the Sea and its relation to Ugaritic literature, one would tend to expect a more limited view of YHWH's kingship in line with the competing spheres of various divine kingships in a polytheistic context.

These representative examples, ranging from Psalms to early poetry, share the expectation that all references to YHWH's kingship in the HB should be modeled from the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. Little consideration is given to the possibility that early poetic expressions of YHWH's kingship could be different from a later more developed expression within the Jerusalemite cult.¹² Assumptions that envision a universal creator-

¹⁰ Erich Zenger and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Psalms 2: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; trans L. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 392.

¹¹ Russell attempts to distinguish YHWH in the Song of the Sea as different from Baal in the Baal Cycle. Thus Russell argues for YHWH's incomparability. See, Brian D. Russell, *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21* (SBL 101; New York: Peter Lang, 2007), 40-44. Yet "If the Song's relation to the Baal Cycle is any indication, YHWH could be a warrior deity who, while unique among the gods (Exod 15:11 // KTU 1.2 I 23-25), need not be considered higher than El." Shawn W. Flynn, Review of Brian D. Russell, *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21* (SBL 101; New York: Peter Lang, 2007) *JHS* 8 (2008): 625-27.

¹² Only a few scholars have studied the concept of YHWH's kingship in terms of its development. One early example is Walter Dietrich, "Gott als König: Zur Frage nach der theologischen und politischen

warrior king in all expressions of YHWH's kingship are rooted in a specific scholarly construct that has influenced current understandings.

A Brief History of Scholarship

The roots of scholarly views towards a static expression of YHWH's kingship can be traced.¹³ While the topic of YHWH's kingship is not prevalent today, it was given a significant amount of attention in the wake of Sigmund Mowinckel's work.¹⁴ Mowinckel offered much to our understanding of YHWH's kingship in the HB, specifically through

Legitimität religiöser Begriffsbildung," *ZThK* 77 (1980): 251-268. Dietrich has influenced later positions that YHWH as king could not be expressed in Israel until after the establishment of the monarchy. "Der mit absoluten Vollmachten ausgestattete Monarch blieb in Israel ein Fremdkörper, so wie Geschichte letztlich eine Episode geblieben ist." See, Dietrich, "Gott als König," 252. Based on this Dietrich assumes that the YHWH of the semi-nomads did not have the expression of YHWH as king. While Roberts does not deal directly with Dietrich, he argues against the assumption that YHWH's kingship could have only been expressed during the monarchy; J. J. M. Roberts, "Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire," in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (ed. T. Ishida. Eisenbrauns: Indiana, 1982), 93-95. The current study follows Roberts, as well as more recent scholarship that has argued for early stages of YHWH's divinity in its pre-Jerusalemite/Canaanite context.

¹³ This is not an exhaustive history of scholarship, but it is only a review of scholarship to establish how a contemporary study of this metaphor can further the discussion. Previous analyses of YHWH's kingship have included such disparate areas such as the cult, Psalms scholarship, Canaanite parallels, and Israelite history and its relationship to the monarchy. Therefore, an exhaustive history of scholarship would be difficult in any case. Several adequate summaries have been conducted and they will be referenced when appropriate.

¹⁴ One recent study has examined the nature of YHWH kingship: Anne Moore, *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth: Understanding the Kingship of God of the Hebrew Bible Through Metaphor* (SBL 99; New York: Peter Lang, 2009). This study, conducted by a NT scholar, attempts to initiate a new discussion of kingdom of God texts in the NT by a systematic re-reading of the kingship texts in the HB. Moore's study will not be used in this examination since many of Moore's discussions lack detail and depth. One example is Moore's dating of all HB kingship texts (except Isaiah 6) to the post-exilic period in order to bring that kingship language closer to the NT. Moore dismisses established aspects of biblical scholarship without proper examination. On the early dating of the Song of the Sea, Moore argues for scholarly confusion in dating from the 13th to the 2nd centuries. She states: "However, Exod 15:1b-18 is an example of how the uncritical adoption of Hebrew Bible scholarship that stresses the significance of original traditions over the redacted texts of the Tanakh has introduced distortions into the Christian Origins' search for the foundational meaning of the kingdom of God." Moore, *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth*, 67. Moore's late dating of texts like Exodus 15:1-18 is merely based on citing Brenner without any detailed analysis; Marc L. Brenner, *The Song of the Sea: Exodus 15.1-21* (BZAW 195; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1991). Unlike Brenner, Moore acknowledges the influence of Robertson in the early date of such texts (David A. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry* [SBLDS 3; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972]) but only states Robertson is not "conclusive." In response, Moore states that archaic forms "may be a case of archaizing" (Moore, *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth*, 68). A more accurate representation of HB scholarship is that the Song of the Sea dates from the 12th-10th century, and scholars like Brenner represent an anomaly position for late dating of the text. This is discussed more in chapter 2. Moore's position on this issue is a misrepresentation of the evidence, since Robertson is more conclusive than Moore admits. Merely stating the possibility of an alternate position does not make it true or more conclusive.

the lens of the enthronement Psalms.¹⁵ Mowinckel's position on the enthronement Psalms began as a reaction to Gunkel who established the genre of royal Psalms and explored the relationship of the human king to YHWH.¹⁶ As Collins has noted, Mowinckel:

argued for a common ritual pattern throughout the ancient Near East, that involved a celebration of a dying and rising god. They also had a high view of the divinity of the king in ancient Israel But he [Mowinckel] was skeptical of the 'patterns,' which were often pieced together from the diverse myths Mowinckel was more interested in the ways in which Near Eastern patterns were adapted by the biblical writers¹⁷

Mowinckel proposed that in pre-exilic Israel there was cultic similarity between Ugaritic texts (specifically the Baal-cycle) and the royal Psalms; he used this similarity to identify a feast, in conjunction with the *akītu* festival in Mesopotamia, that celebrated the enthronement of YHWH each year during the autumn festival in what Mowinckel classified as enthronement Psalms: Pss 47, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100.¹⁸ In part, this

¹⁵ Mowinckel's 1951 work was translated in 1962. A recent edition by Eerdmans preserves the page numbers of that 1962 translation; Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (trans. D.R. Ap-Thomas. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 2004), 106. Based on this work, Dietrich also assumes that the concept of YHWH's kingship developed only around Jerusalem. Dietrich, "Gott als König," 259.

¹⁶ Mowinckel developed Gunkel's classification of the royal Psalms. While Gunkel saw the connections between these Psalms and the ANE, Mowinckel (under the influence of the German anthropologist Gronbech) viewed these Israelite expressions of divine-human kingship similar to Mesopotamia and Egypt. This early development influenced Mowinckel's construction of the enthronement Psalms as a cultic ceremony like its ANE counterparts such as the Babylonian *akītu* festival. See, Sigmund Mowinckel, *Psalmstudien II: Buch I-II*. (Amsterdam: Verlag P. Schippers), 1922. See the discussion of Gunkel's contribution in Aubrey R. Johnson, "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and The Old Testament" *ET* 62 (1951): 36-37.

¹⁷ John J. Collins, "Mowinckel's *He That Cometh* Revisited" *ST* 61 (2007): 4; S.H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958); Ivan Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1943; 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 1967). Mowinckel's work contributes to the Myth and Ritual School/*Kultgeschichtliche Schule*. Its general goal was a reconstruction of the early cult utilizing relevant Canaanite parallels. It focused upon the cult that grew out of the Solomonic Temple as reflected in the Psalms and subsequently the kingship of YHWH as the primary cultic focus. It competes with the "History of Religions School," which emphasized covenant renewal ceremonies as the primary cultic activity in Israel. Cross provides an introduction and analysis of both schools: Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), 79-83. Cross' criticism of Mowinckel is that: "In reconstructing the cultic function or *Sitz im Leben* of such hymns, one is never quite sure whether he arrives at a description of Israel's royal cult or at a picture of an old Canaanite cult from which the hymnic tradition stems"; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 83.

¹⁸ For more information regarding the *akītu* festival in Mesopotamia, see Marc J.H. Linssen, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon: The Temple Ritual Texts as Evidence for Hellenistic Cult Practice* (Leiden:

festival celebrated YHWH's rise to kingship due to a cosmological battle and victory over his enemies. As participants, the king and the people triumphantly marched the ark/throne of YHWH into Jerusalem and in this cultic act reinforced the righteousness of the human king.¹⁹ This cultic festival centered on a liturgical acclamation; Mowinckel interpreted this acclamation (יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ) as a liturgical expression in the context of the cultic ceremony celebrating YHWH's rise to kingship. Mowinckel argued יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ should be understood as "Yahweh has become king" rather than "YHWH is king" or "YHWH reigns."²⁰

The features of YHWH's kingship in the HB, for Mowinckel, were typified in the Jerusalem cult through the enthronement Psalms and this context served as the most

Brill, 2004), 184-96; Svend A. Pallis, *The Babylonian Akitu Festival* (Historisk-filologiske Meddeleser 12; Copenhagen: Høst & Søn, 1926); Wilfred G. Lambert, "The Conflict on the Akitu House," *Iraq* 25 (1963): 189-90.

¹⁹ This is similar to the *sed* festival in Egypt evident at the Edfu temple. Here the king would re-establish his kingship through a variety of ritual acts such as: putting on the *sed* festival cloak (the king from Dynasty 1), the erection of obelisks (as evident for Thutmose I and Hatshepsut at Karnak), the erection of the *djed* pillar (during the Sed festival of Amenhotep III at Thebes), and the king running a course around (or between) the *sed* festival boundary markers in the court outside the pyramid complex to prove human kingship. For some discussion of this festival and other rituals of human kingship see, Ronald J. Leprohon, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt," in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East* Vol. 1 (ed., J. M. Sasson; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1995), 273-87.

²⁰ Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 107. He translates this "YHWH has become king" in (Ps 47:8; 93:1; 96: 10; 97:1). The question of how to understand this liturgical statement took up a great deal of scholarship. Thus, as king who has defeated his enemies (93:3; 98:1), YHWH's kingship implies a universal kingship (97:5) that is also expressed in the king as creator (93:1b; 95:3-5). Mowinckel effectively represented this Jerusalemite vision of YHWH as king and such a representation was and is still influential for scholars. Kraus disagrees with Mowinckel, arguing that a state, rather than an action, is being described. See, Hans J. Kraus, *Psalmen I* (Biblicher Kommentar-Altes Testament; Neukirchen Kris Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960), 201-205. For Mowinckel's response to Kraus see, Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 230-31; 237-39; for Ps 47, Eissfeldt believed that it should be translated "YHWH is king" where the Psalmist is describing a past event on how YHWH has become king; Otto Eissfeldt, "Jahwe als König," *ZAW* 46 (1928): 102. Other scholars who prefer the acclamation rather than the enthronement translation are Roland De Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (trans. John McHugh; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), 504-506 and Edward Lipiński, "Yahweh *mālāk*," *Bib* 44 (1963): 405-60. For a summary and some discussion of this scholarship, see David J. A. Clines, *On the Way to Postmodern: Old Testament Essays* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 639-64.

likely from which to understand YHWH's kingship in the HB.²¹ Not only did this thesis identify a major Jerusalemite cultic festival at a particular time of year, it deduced the purpose for the festival, thus raising YHWH's enthronement and kingship to an important level in the study of early Israelite expressions, bringing recognition to its importance as a theme in the HB, and solidifying the role of Jerusalem as a major cultic centre for the locus of this expression. Many aspects of Mowinckel's theory remain largely accepted in scholarship.²² The present writer accepts that there was some type of festival in pre-exilic Jerusalem to celebrate the kingship of YHWH and that it is preserved in the Psalms.

Mowinckel's influential thesis, with little attention to where those traditions derived from, has led to a trend in scholarship whereby any texts of YHWH as king are interpreted through the lens of the enthronement Psalms.²³ A brief review of scholarship will demonstrate this assumption is still present, that it leads to a conflation of different forms of YHWH's kingship, and falls to identify different stages and developments of YHWH's kingship.

²¹ Mowinckel's cultic context for constructing YHWH's kingship did give an overall picture of YHWH as king in the Jerusalemite cult. It represented YHWH as the enthroned king in the Jerusalem Temple who was in control of creation and thus the universal king.

²² For an excellent review of Mowinckel's theory, that traces the majority who agreed with him and the few that did not, as well as a response to those critics, see J. J. M. Roberts "Mowinckel's Enthronement Festival," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. P. W. Flint and P. D. Miller; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 97-115. For positions that disagreed with Mowinckel, Mowinckel himself summarizes these positions and responds to them; Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 106-92, 228-32.

²³ Mowinckel was himself not entirely guilty of this generalization. In parts of Mowinckel's discussion, he gives some passing reference to small differences at different stages: "Some poets declare expressly that it was on the occasion of the Exodus and the making of the covenant that Yahweh became king; in that case the kingship is usually limited to Israel, whereas it is, as a rule, universal in the enthronement Psalms"; Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 108. Likewise, "The conception of the deity as king was taken over by the Israelites from the Canaanites, who had received it from the great kingdoms on the Euphrates and Tigris and Nile, where it had been developed as early as ancient Sumerian times. When Israel had gathered into one state, and acquired its chief national holy place in Jerusalem, Yahweh was looked upon as king of Zion"; Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 114. Such statements were only observations and did not involve any significant discussion.

Scholarship Since Mowinckel

Just before Mowinckel's work, there was a trend in seeing continuity in YHWH's kingship. In 1936 Martin Buber argued that the kingship of God was a historical reality for the early period of Israel (Judg 8:22-23).²⁴ Buber's specific goal was to focus on localized deities of the patriarchs, such as *malk*, unique from 'el and ba'al. Buber does this by drawing differences between characteristics of baalism and the hypothetical features of *malk* based on the linguistic differences between the names.²⁵ Buber attempts to follow his linguistic construction of the traveling, patriarchal god *malk* through a wide variety of biblical passages. While Buber has argued for a consistent notion of YHWH's kingship, in looking for similarity of the traveling-patriarchal god *malk* throughout the HB, little change or development was recognized since the purpose was to see unity in the '*malk*' passages.²⁶

In the 1950's, as Mowinckel's views were gaining influence, Aubrey R. Johnson reinforced the context of the autumn festival.²⁷ Johnson concluded that Israel's practice of the New Year festival gave the people and the king an opportunity to renew their

²⁴ Martin Buber, *The Kingship of God* (trans. R. Scheimann; New York: Harper and Row, 1967). This is a translation of Martin Buber, *Königtum Gottes* (Berlin: Schocken, 1936). Central for Buber is also Deut 33:5. Buber argues that the *malk* of early texts was the same deity adopted in the Sinai covenant, thus there was no separation between *malk* and YHWH. At Sinai the Israelites were expressing the same God as in Judg 8:22-23.

²⁵ Buber, *The Kingship of God*, 97.

²⁶ In 1967, Ivan Engnell published *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. The primary purpose of the work was to be a foundation for a later study that would examine sacral kingship in Israel. Yet this study never came. We only have hints of what such a study would have looked like in Engnell's conclusion. Engnell also sees a continuity in YHWH's kingship since he proposes that YHWH was: "the great west-Semitic celestial-atmospheric high god, carried to Canaan already by the first Semitic immigrant . . ."; Engnell, *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, 177.

²⁷ Johnson's agreement with aspects of Mowinckel's theory is most apparent in Johnson, "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship," 39. This article remains one of the only 'history of scholarships' on divine kingship, in this case, from 1922 to 1951. His later work is Aubrey R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955).

moral integrity. It is difficult to see much difference between Mowinckel and Johnson.²⁸ The latter discusses that YHWH's kingship weaves together the separate traditions of his victory over cosmic seas and his victory over Israel's enemies.²⁹ Johnson, like Mowinckel, represents YHWH as judge and enthroned king, ruler over chaos and creator: "In other words, the divine King is not only worshipped as the Creator; He is also revered as the Judge. The second point is . . . the identification of this King with One who has been proved 'mighty in battle.'"³⁰ Thanks to Mowinckel, Johnson saw YHWH in the Psalms as a universal creator and warrior king.

John Gray is another example of scholar's tendency to see sameness in the expressions of YHWH's kingship. This example is particularly helpful, since it moves beyond the enthronement Psalms, beyond Mowinckel and his interlocutors, and beyond the patriarchal focus of Buber. In 1979 Gray offered a masterful study that traced YHWH's kingship from the enthronement Psalms, through pre-exilic and post-exilic prophets and then through the New Testament down to the Church Fathers.³¹ If there was an opportunity to study why change occurred in YHWH's kingship, Gray's approach was the ideal venue. Gray was also well positioned to do this study from a critical perspective given his past work.³² While he offered many valuable insights, he begins with the enthronement Psalms as the primary context from which to understand YHWH's

²⁸ See a similar observation in John Gray, review of A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, VT 6 (1956): 440-443.

²⁹ YHWH as king is: "Creator and Sustainer of the universe, which appears to have had its roots in the earlier worship of Canaan as represented by the Jebusite cults in Jerusalem"; Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, 81 and 138.

³⁰ Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*, 74.

³¹ John Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979).

³² John Gray, "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development," VT 6 (1956): 268-85; John Gray, "Royal Substitution in the ANE," PEQ 57 (1955): 180-82; John Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra Texts and Their Relevance to the Old Testament* (VTSup 5; Leiden: Brill, 1957; sec. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1965).

kingship. Here, the influence of Mowinckel is reinforced; Gray believes that in those Psalms “we may find the surest clue to the origin of the concept in the religion of Israel and at the same time recognize its essential features . . .”.³³ Therefore, Gray finds in the enthronement Psalms an expression of YHWH’s kingship consistent with Mowinckel’s. YHWH is the king enthroned between the cherubim who is universal ruler and king of heaven and earth, a position established through his victory in divine war and rule over the forces of chaos. No matter the biblical text before him, Gray seeks consistency in the expression of YHWH’s kingship. For example, in Ezekiel it is “an essential motif of the demonstration of the Kingship of God in the cosmic conflict, while the burning of the weapons of the defeated forces of Chaos (Ezek 39.9f) is a motif of the Enthronement Psalm 46:10 . . .”.³⁴ Similarly, in Second-Isaiah, “God is not only King Universal; He is King of Israel . . .” in passages like Isa 41:21; 43:15; 44:6.³⁵

A static expression of YHWH remains in Gray’s 1956 article³⁶ and is again summarized in his later work: “The essential features of the theme [YHWH’s kingship], in spite of its adaptation, are never quite lost. A return to first origins enables us clearly to recognize these, to give them their true emphasis and better to appraise the later development of the theme of the kingship of God.”³⁷ Like others before him, Gray’s immediate and singular source for understanding early forms of YHWH’s kingship remains the Psalms and specifically the enthronement Psalms as understood by

³³ Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine*, 39.

³⁴ Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine*, 160.

³⁵ Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine*, 167.

³⁶ Gray, “The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God,” 268-285.

³⁷ Gray, *The Biblical Doctrine*, 271. Gray also intermingles Baal, El and YHWH through the lens of the enthronement Psalms in Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, 157, 182-83.

Mowinckel.³⁸ While a study of consistency is not incorrect, since there is a consistency present, this study seeks a fuller exploration of the “adaptation” to which Gray refers.

One final example demonstrates Mowinckel’s influence on the scholarly trend. Brettler would return to the priority of human kingship (Johnson) as the dominant lens from which to understand YHWH’s kingship via linguistic analysis (Buber).³⁹ Brettler argues that before the metaphor “God as King” can be understood, a separate analysis is required of “God” and “king.”⁴⁰ The focus on human kingship again sets the monarchical, Jerusalemite context as the ideal time-period to understand the expression.

In arguing for the primacy of human kingship and resisting an analysis of change in the metaphor, Brettler concedes, “we must consider the possibility that some divine kingship texts are pre-monarchical.”⁴¹ Yet his argument for not dealing with these texts is that “the vast majority of biblical texts . . . are traditionally dated from after the establishment of the monarchy.”⁴² The argument of quantity is Brettler’s sole reason for avoiding early kingship texts in his reconstruction.⁴³ Yet just because the majority of

³⁸ This remains the same problem in John Gray, “The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms” *VT* 11 (1961), 1-29. Here, Gray admits that there are differences, but does not explore their significance. For him “When all this is said, however, [biblical] passages which deal with the conception of the kingship of God reveal an astonishing agreement”; Gray, “The Kingship of God,” 1. Interestingly, in this article Gray notices that the Psalms are drawing off different sources, which we will discuss later in our own analysis of these Psalms.

³⁹ Marc Zvi Brettler, *God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor* (JSOTSup 76; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989). Brettler’s thesis is a return to Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* and would later be forwarded by Erhard Gerstenberger, “‘World Domination’ in Yahweh Kingship Psalms: Down to the Roots of Globalizing Concepts and Strategies,” *HBT* 23 (2001): 192-210.

⁴⁰ Brettler, *God is King*, 23.

⁴¹ Brettler concedes that Exod 15:18 (יְהוָה יִמְלֹךְ לָעַלְם וָעַד) is a pre-monarchical text. Brettler, *God is King*, 23, 14.

⁴² Brettler, *God is King*, 14.

⁴³ Recognizing this difficult argument, Brettler entertains the possibility that human kingship was modeled after divine kingship. Citing the work of Frankfort and others, he claims that “there is no evidence that *in Israel* the human king was generally patterned after God” [my emphasis]; Brettler, *God is King*, 15. This is a careful statement by Brettler. First note the italics “in Israel.” Brettler is using our lack of knowledge regarding early Israel to make his point. Second, that the human king is not patterned God is clear thanks to Brettler’s evidence. He spends most of his study drawing parallels between the two; therefore, if we can prove divine kingship existed before human kingship, many of those parallels could be

texts come after the establishment of a human king—the time when most writing was likely taking place—does not mean that Israel would have then ignored all previous theological expressions of divine kingship both from within Israel and from broader ANE influences.⁴⁴ Brettler does not give enough evidence for why we should follow his assumption “that human imagery has been projected upon God rather than vice versa.”⁴⁵ A different approach is to ask how the later expression of YHWH’s kingship relates to, or is different from, the earlier material.

Often the argument is made that Israel’s expression of a deity, as king, could only have originated after the institution of the Israelite monarchy.⁴⁶ This position confines YHWH’s kingship to the enthronement Psalms. Another factor in promoting this singular context is that scholarship on YHWH’s kingship has largely been practiced in isolation from studies on early Israelite poetry, and more recently, studies about the development of YHWHism.⁴⁷ Israel had exposure to the concept of the deities as kings long before their own institution of the monarchy, and the vision of YHWH’s kingship in that early

considered the later copying the former. Finally, the human king need not be “generally” patterned after God in order for a theology of divine kingship to exist prior to the practice of human kingship in Israel.

⁴⁴ Notwithstanding the early dating of divine kingship in texts like Exod 15:18; Num 23:21 and Deut 33:5, Brettler has also not dealt with the Ugaritic material and YHWH as head of the divine council (e.g., Ps 82). The image of YHWH/El as judge of the council clearly predates the monarchy and contains early evidence of YHWH’s rule. Smith argues that the Davidic dynasty drew on older material to express their divine king. He gives Judg 5:3-5 and 1 Sam 7:10, 12:18 as examples; Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990), 55. Israel clearly had knowledge of the monarchy—and deities as kings—without it having been a feature in Israel; Roberts, “Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire,” 93-95; Tryggve Mettinger, “YHWH Sabaoth, the Heavenly King on the Earthly Throne,” in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (ed. T. Ishida Eisenbrauns: Indiana, 1982), 130.

⁴⁵ Brettler, *God is King*, 15.

⁴⁶ Roberts has challenged this idea, but no study has made a fuller analysis of what the role of the early and late stages of YHWH’s kingship are. Here Roberts uses Exod 15:18 as a clear early example of YHWH’s kingship and notes the lack of responses to challenge this dating, the development of the monarchy and its use of divine kingship to battle human kingship; Roberts, “Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire,” 93-95. Also see Mettinger’s similar position that YHWH as king in the pre-monarchic period is a position that cannot be challenged; Tryggve Mettinger, “YHWH Sabaoth,” 130.

⁴⁷ While the details of early poetry and its view of YHWH’s kingship will be discussed in chapter two, one influential example is Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*.

literature must be accounted for in order to understand the origins of YHWH's fully developed kingship in the Psalms. Rather than this approach, many scholars envision a universal creator king in all references to YHWH's kingship and become confused when warrior language is absent in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. No study has yet explored the difference of expression in the stages of YHWH's kingship. YHWH's kingship in the context of the Jerusalemite cult represents only one stage (likely a highpoint) in the development of this Israelite expression.⁴⁸

The influence and effective expression of Mowinckel's representation of YHWH as king in the Jerusalem cult with all the implications of that kingship (universal king who is enthroned on the ark and expressed as the creator deity) grasped, but also limited, the imagination of later scholarship. A fuller articulation of YHWH's kingship can admit the nuances of that expression at different stages and then ask how that kingship developed. This study will explore changes and adaptations to YHWH's kingship. The picture is more complex than previously articulated, with a variety of traditions adding to and influencing the development of YHWH's kingship before the Jerusalemite cult.⁴⁹

The Backgrounds of Israelite Divinity

This study accepts the work of various scholars who demonstrate stages in YHWH's divinity, with earlier forms closer to the polytheistic expression of a Canaanite

⁴⁸ Indeed, this is an important point in Israel's history "with the rise of the David-Solomonic imperial state, however, that the royal language for both God and human king reached its apex . . . That tradition consisted of three main points: (1) Yahweh is great king . . . (2) Yahweh has chosen the Davidic house . . . (3) Yahweh has chosen Zion, as the earthly dais of his universal rule"; J. J. M. Roberts, "The Enthronement of Yhwh and David: The Abiding Theological significance of the Kingship Language of the Psalms," *CBQ* (2002): 676.

⁴⁹ "There is every reason to believe that the conception of Yahweh as king of the township derives from the supreme Canaanite deity in Jerusalem, El Elyon, who Yahweh succeeded." Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, 114. In our assessment this is an incomplete picture of early Israelite history. It presumes that the kingship of YHWH was not a theological expression until the adoption of Jerusalem by the Israelites. As we will see, there is much earlier evidence to understand how early Israelite divine kingship was expressed before the Jerusalem cult.

context, while later forms move closer to the monotheistic expressions of Second-Isaiah. They have demonstrated a late development of monotheism and illuminated the early stages of YHWH prior to a monotheistic expression.⁵⁰ Such studies account for YHWH's early history in a Levantine/Canaanite context and convincingly relate passages like Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82 to a chronological development within YHWHism. A brief review, offered below, of contributions to the early stages of YHWH's divinity allows us to understand the Canaanite context from which early notions of YHWH kingship developed and provides a backdrop for a more accurate assessment of YHWH's kingship at the earliest stages.

It has long been known that the earliest origins of YHWH occurred outside Israel. Yet there are two locales that inform the early stages of YHWHism: the first is Egypt and the second is Ugarit. External evidence has emerged in a fifteenth-century list of place names found at Amarna that refers to the land of the Shasu and specifically to: *t3 s3sw yhw3*. Recently, the Egyptologist Schneider stated: "It has become a commonly accepted view both in Egyptology and Biblical Studies that the name of the later god Yahweh – the tetragrammaton YHWH – makes an early appearance in Egyptian topographical lists of the New Kingdom, where it is closely associated with a provenance that is characteristic to statements about Yahweh's origins in the Old Testament."⁵¹ This partly depends on how much credence one gives to this evidence. Thus the Shasu texts are an early,

⁵⁰ Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001), 61-63; Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. A fine, recent summary of the early stages of YHWHism on which the current discussion is based, is available in Mark S. Smith, "God in Israel's Bible: Divinity between the World and Israel, between the Old and the New," *CBQ* (2012): forthcoming. This will be the published version of Smith's presidential address delivered at the Seventy-fourth International Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, held at Assumption College, Worcester, Massachusetts, 6-9 August 2011.

⁵¹ Thomas Schneider, "The First Documented Occurrence of the God Yahweh? (Book of the Dead Princeton 'Roll 5')," *JANER* 7 (2008): 113.

possible reference to YHWH⁵² in which appropriate cautions and disagreements should be heeded.⁵³ Notably the locus of Shasu texts corresponds with some of the earliest poetry of the HB.⁵⁴ Particularly, those texts demonstrate that YHWH originates from outside the land of Israel, from some type of mountainous region in the south, a fact also supported by the inscriptional evidence.⁵⁵ Finally, the existence of YHWH's origins outside Israel is even preserved in the biblical tradition of Moses learning of YHWH from his father in law Jethro.⁵⁶

Yet at some point, YHWH's divinity corresponds more with the northern deities encountered at Ugarit. Foremost among the scholars who have drawn our attention to

⁵² Karl van der Toorn, "Yahweh," in *DDD*, 911-12; Shmuel Ahituv, *Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents* (Jerusalem: Magnes; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 121-22; Lars E. Axelsson, *The Lord Rose Up from Seir: Studies in the History and Traditions of the Negev and Southern Judah* (ConBOT 25; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987), 48-59; Raphael Giveon, *Les bédouines Shosou des documents égyptiens* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

⁵³ Hans Goedicke, "The Tetragram in Egyptian?" *SSEA* 24 (1994): 24-27.

⁵⁴ The southern origins of YHWH are reflected in references to Edom and Seir (Deut 33:2; Judg 5:4; Num 24:18).

⁵⁵ Many inscriptions dealing with early YHWHism are attested from southern locales. Cross was the first to give careful attention the pattern of the warrior-god marching from the south in Deut 32:2; Judg 5:4; 1 Sam 22:8-18 (// Ps 18:8-18); Hab 3:3-11; Zech 9:14; Ps 50:2-3; Ps 68:8-10; 16-17: Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973), 155-56; Two well-known inscriptions found in the southern Levant evidence a cult of YHWH in the 8th century. The first is at Khirbet el-Kom; inscription 3 invokes a blessing for Uriyahu by YHWH and his Asherah (*wl'šrth*). Similarly, at Kuntillet 'Ajrud inscription 7 also has a blessing of YHWH associated with Asherah (*l' J'šrt*). Much scholarship has been written on this. My position is that the inscriptions are referring to the deity Asherah, in this case the consort of YHWH at a time when such expressions of divinity were more common than the Dtr reforms that eventually come from Jerusalem. Thus, regarding the 3ms suffix of Khirbet el-Kom 3.5, it is a possessive indicating the wife of YHWH. A biblical indication of this interpretation is that the prophetesses of Asherah (1 Kings 18:19) are not killed along with the prophets of Baal (1 Kings 18:40). For more discussion, see Shmuel Ahituv, "Did God Really Have a Wife?" *BAR* 32 (2006): 62-66; Pirhiya Beck, "The Drawings from Horvat Teiman (Kuntillet 'Ajrud)," *TA* 9 (1982): 3-68; John A. Emerton, "New Light on Israelite Religion: the Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982): 2-20; Judith M. Hadley, "The Khirbet el-Qom Inscription," *VT* 37 (1987): 50-62; Judith M. Hadley, *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah. Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess*, (UCOP 57; Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 2000; J. Glen Taylor, "The Two Earliest Known Representations of Yahweh," in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie* (ed. L. Eslinger and J. G. Taylor; JSOTSupp 67; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 557-66; J. Glen Taylor, "Was Yahweh Worshiped as the Sun?" *BAR* 20 (1994): 53-51, 90-91. For both inscriptions also see, Sandra L. Gogel, *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew* (SBLRBS 23, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998). For a discussion of both, also see chapter two in Saul M. Olyan, *Asherah and the Cult of Yahweh in Israel* (SBLMS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 23-37.

⁵⁶ This has become known as the Midianite or Kenite hypothesis.

early YHWHism, its type and roots before monotheism, and its connections to Ugaritic religion are Smith and Day.⁵⁷ Their studies about the deities at Ugarit have greatly informed the reconstruction of early YHWHism.

The developments made in this area are important for understanding the type of divinity, and thus kingship, we can expect for YHWH in the early texts of the HB. It is this broader context that Handy typifies of the divine kingship described at Ugarit, by classifying the kingships of many gods as “spheres of authority.”⁵⁸ Each deity in the divine council has its own kingship, and as king, is responsible for the different spheres of authority, often related to the natural world.⁵⁹ Therefore, Baal’s sphere of authority as the storm god is different than El’s sphere of authority over the divine council or Mot’s kingship over the netherworld. In the context of a divine council with multiple kingships, any ancient text that claims kingship for a particular deity does not imply one, singular kingship, but rather expresses a group of limited kingships, each responsible for its own section of the cosmos.⁶⁰ There is no reason to believe differently of early concepts of YHWH’s kingship.

⁵⁷ Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism Israel’s Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001), 61-63; John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*.

⁵⁸ Lowell K. Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 114. Handy borrows this phrase from discussions on bureaucracy in Stanoslav Andreski, *Max Weber’s Insights and Errors* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), 99-107.

⁵⁹ Some texts even suggest each god has their own divine council. The prose texts distinguish between two councils: *dr ʾil w phr bʿl* “circle of El and council of Baal” (1.39.7; 1.41.16; 1.87.17-18; Marvin Pope, *El in Ugaritic Texts* [VTSup 2; Leiden: Brill, 1955], 90). Perhaps as a background to this situation we could imagine Baal having his own assembly; it is possible that the Baal cycle sets up the background to how that council was formed. Thus Baal’s subservience takes place before that reality of achieving kingship.

⁶⁰ The implications of disturbing this divine order are evident when Horus and Seth battle for kingship. During that time, other aspects of the world cannot function. In the Contendings of Horus and Seth the Universal Lord asks “what is the meaning of your exercising authority alone by yourselves?” “The Contendings of Horus and Seth” translated by Edward F. Wente in *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, and Poetry* (ed. William K. Simpson; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 27. The disorder caused by Osiris’ kingship not replaced is emphasized due to the length of

The question has always been whether YHWH parallels Baal more than El? Put another way, was “YHWH” an early title of El?⁶¹ Cross states that YHWH came out of an El cult since “many of the traits and functions of ’El appear as traits and functions of Yahweh in the earliest traditions”.⁶² In a short discussion, admitting first that part of YHWH’s original character may be lost, Smith suggests El may have been the god of the Exodus. While this area of scholarship is well trod and scholars are able to draw out similarities and differences between YHWH and other Levantine deities, they are reluctant to state when or how YHWH came to adapt elements of El or Baal. A brief review of the divinity and kingship of El and of Baal helps situate what type of YHWH’s early kingship to expect and that YHWH’s early expressions are primarily constructed from a Baal type. This brief analysis will in turn help contextualize the corpus of texts that pertain to early notions of YHWH’s kingship, discussed in chapter 2.

The most relevant features for comparison with YHWH are Baal’s roles as king and warrior. Upon meeting Baal in the Baal Cycle he does not yet have kingship, a palace, nor any authority in the divine council. He is the storm god whose power is exemplified in thunder and lightning (*KTU* 1.4 V 6-9). His epithets attest to his warrior nature and kingship: “Most High”, “Baal of Ugarit” (which is often linked with the

time the council takes to choose a deity to replace Osiris. Since Horus and Seth are engaged in battle each day, they are not able to fulfill their own roles. In the meantime the role of Osiris is also not being fulfilled, while the noise these battles cause disturb the council and possibly halt their ability to conduct their proceedings.

⁶¹ Smith notes the various scholars and their views on the feasibility of this position; Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 145-46. For example, de Moor the following scholars believe it is a title; Johannes Cornelias de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL 91; Leuven Peeters, 1990), 237-39. Others like Mettinger believes it is not a title; Tryggve Mettinger, “The Elusive Essence: YHWH El and Baal and the Distinctiveness of Israelite Faith,” *Die Hebraische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte* (Fs. R Rendtorff, ed. E. Blum, C. Macholz and E.W. Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 393-417.

⁶² Thomas B. Dozeman, *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition* (New York University: Oxford University Press, 1996), 156.

temple) and “Baal zaphon”. Those epithets also describe him as a warrior: “valiant”, “hero/warrior”, “strong”, “son of El”, “baal/lord”, “champion”, “rider of the clouds” and “tempest”.⁶³

Significant for this study is the relationship between the two characteristics of warrior and kingship since Baal’s battles gain him kingship. Despite Baal’s accomplishments, his power is not absolute and neither is his kingship universal. Thus Baal is a primary example of Handy’s “spheres of authority”. Baal relies on the assistance of others to reach his goals. If the weapons used to defeat Yamm represent Baal’s control of lightning, control of that natural force is subject to error. Indeed, the first weapon has no effect: *ʿz ym lymk ltnḡšn [.] pnth* “Yamm is strong, he does not sink. His joints do not contract . . .” (*KTU* 1.2 IV 17-18).⁶⁴ It is the skill of the craftsman Kothar, not necessarily the skill of Baal, that ensures victory with a second weapon. Further, Baal is affected by the actions of other deities to a state that must be controlled. For example, despite his actions before the council, at times, such as when El claims Baal is Yamm’s slave, (*KTU* 1.2. I 36-38), Baal is shaken (*KTU* 1.2. I 38), strikes out at Yamm, and must be controlled by the female deities (*KTU* 1.2. I 40).⁶⁵ Thus Smith

⁶³ For a review of Baal’s designations, see Nicholas Wyatt, “Titles of the Ugaritic Storm God,” *UF* 24 (1992): 403-24.

⁶⁴ Through linguistic and iconographic analyses, Smith suggests that the weapon may imply Baal’s use of lightning in this scene. Smith, *UBC* I, 338.

⁶⁵ For *ap anš zbl bʿl* one possibility is “the Prince became livid with anger”; Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition* (2 vols *HdO* 67; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 998. The interpretation likely hinges on *ap* as “nose/anger” or reading *ap* as a conjunction and the meaning of *anš* as the anger. The latter is some type of failure, or becoming sick. By contrast, Smith reads *anš* as “shaken” and *ap* as the conjunction: “Then Prince Baal is shaken” *UBC* I, 268. While divine anger is limited in the Baal Cycle, the context seems to warrant the sense of anger. The cognates though seem to indicate sickness without reference to anger. The Akk *enēšum* means primarily weakness (*CAD* E) with no reference to anger and the Heb. *ʾnš* is something that is incurable. Here we prefer the translation of Smith and the contextual suitability of Lete and Sanmartín. A suitable translation would be: “Then Prince Baal was stricken [with anger]”.

observes that without the help of others, Baal's kingship would be meaningless.⁶⁶ The overall impression is of a limited kingship over a particular sphere of authority rooted in the warrior tradition.

Likewise, YHWH began as a minor, or lesser deity than the head god (Deut 32:8-9). When YHWH eventually ascended to the place of head deity in Israel (Ps 82?), then many features of El were transferred to YHWH. In part this could have been caused by a combination of factors such as the establishment of the Israelite cultic centre in Jerusalem. Other factors may have been the increasing distance being placed between Baal and YHWH (1 Kgs 17-18) that sought to achieve victory over the popular worship of Baal by associating YHWH less with features of Baal (1 Kgs 19) and more with the features of El.

Yet simply to construct YHWH's kingship in the YHWH kingship Psalms as an El type is not viable. While it is possible, and likely, that there was a stage when YHWH's divinity took on features of El, the type of kingship described in the Psalms, as will be discussed in chapter 2, is quite different than Baal or El's divinities. As we will see, one of the primary features of the kingship Psalms is creation. While there are creative elements to El's kingship, no creation mythology is [preserved] at Ugarit.⁶⁷

El's divinity is broader than Baal's, but still not of the type found in the YHWH kingship Psalms. El is the head of the divine council and its king. It is clear that El is enthroned (*KTU* 1.3 V; 1.4 IV-V) and is referred to as king. This is apparent when other

⁶⁶ Smith, UBC I, 361.

⁶⁷ In a plea to Kirta for the city of Udum, El is called the father of man (*CAT* 1.12 III. 29-32). ["Kirta" Trans. Edward L. Greenstein in Simon B. Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (SBLWAW 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 17.] El is also expressed in terms of a craftsman and healing god when he makes a healing goddess for Kirta "I will craft and I will establish; I will establish one who casts out pain, One who chases away lingering illness." (*KTU* 1.16 V. 25-26). His epithets reinforce this role as "creator of created things" (*CTA* 4.2.11; 4.3.32; 6.2.5, 11; 17.1.25). For other epithets of creation for El, see Theodore Mullen Jr., *The Assembly of the Gods*, 12-22.

deities visit El on his mountain or in his tent.⁶⁸ Athirat approaches El to ask that a house be built for Baal (*KTU* 1.4 IV 30-62) as does Anat (*KTU* 1.3 V 30-44).⁶⁹ While El is not the only one implied as king in the Ugaritic corpus, his seniority is clear from other designations.⁷⁰ He is the aged deity of the council. This is likely linked to his role as Father of the Gods. Specifically El is the father of Baal, since Baal is the *bn 'il* “son of El” (*KTU* 1.17 VI 29). El also has the wisest (*hkm*) decree of the council (*KTU* 1.3 V 31; 1.4 IV 42) and this position is symbolized in his enthronement.

Compared to YHWH’s universal and absolute kingship in the YHWH kingship Psalms, El is a weak deity, whose authority is undercut and challenged. His age, indicated by El as a bearded figure (*KTU* 1.4 V 3-4), indicates that there is a past mythic background to El that may have echoes of a warrior tradition.⁷¹ Any warrior representation is however a past memory and El’s current position may be somewhat declining in Ugaritic circles by the time the Baal Cycle was composed.⁷² Perhaps El was losing his status and Baal was seen as the rising deity.⁷³ Indeed, the exploration and

⁶⁸ Smith also notes that El’s enthronement is a feature in some Phoenician inscriptions (KAI 4:4-5; 14:9, 22; 26); Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990), 9. Also see the discussion in E. Theodore Mullen Jr., *The Assembly of the Gods* (HSM 24; California: Scholars Press, 1980), 22-45.

⁶⁹ E. Theodore Mullen Jr., *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literatures* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 23.

⁷⁰ According to some he is the only one refereed to as king. Mullen, *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literatures*, 22. Yet see *KTU* 1.4 iv 43 “Our king is Valiant Baal”; see Nicholas Wyatt, “The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God,” *UF* (1992): 404.

⁷¹ Miller has offered a welcomed correction and balance to the representation of El as aged, removed, and weak. He argues that there was a tradition that saw El as a warrior. *CTA* 6.6 shows that El strikes fear into the heart of Mot and Miller rightfully asks how El could have become king without some form of a battle; Patrick D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1973), 49. Miller also offers various possibilities that El was a warrior in the past, reinforced with possible parallels between YHWH and El in the HB. *Ibid.*, 51-63.

⁷² This is especially true considering the likely date of the Cycle, which Smith assigns to the 13th Century. Also note that the House of the High Priest survived until 1185 BCE. UBC II, 7.

⁷³ For early forms of this argument, see Pope, *El in Ugaritic Texts*, 27-32. See also the next footnote.

implementation of this shift may be occurring in the “Baal Cycle”.⁷⁴

The possible echoes of El’s background are silenced later in the written tradition. El is seen with his instruments of war that he never uses for their purpose. In *KTU* 1.4 IV 27-30, Athirat approaches El in his tabernacle: *hlm il kyphmh yprq lšb wyšḥq pʿnh lhdm ytpd wykrkr ušbʿth* “As soon as El saw her, he breaks into a smile and laughs, he places his feet on the footstool and twiddles his digits.” This passive image of kingship, is almost satirical when juxtaposed with Baal’s active kingship a few lines later: *mlkn aliy[n] bʿl tptn in dʿlnh* “Our king is mighty Baal Our ruler, there is no-one over him” (*KTU* 1.4 IV 43-44). For El, kingship is a symbolic position that is often not used for its purpose. In another passage, while El is entertaining his women, he uses something (his bow?) to shoot a bird and has it cooked for a feast (*KTU* 1.23 37-38).⁷⁵ The dominant imagery of sexuality drowns out the possible uses of weapons for their purposes of maintaining kingship.⁷⁶ Whether this is imagery of a feast, of sexual activity, or both, the

⁷⁴ Also consider the archaeology of Ras Shamra, in which the later strata have temples built to Baal, not El. For a discussion of theories regarding El’s decline in light of Baal rise to power, see Pope, *El in Ugaritic Texts*; Ulf Oldenburg, *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1969); and especially Conrad E. L’Heureux, *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods: El, Baʿal and Rephaʿim* (HSM 21; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979). Wyatt also notes it is surprising that, given the small number of texts we have for Baal, he has more divine designations than El. Wyatt, “The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God,” 403. Miller lists some other reasons why El appears inept. First Yamm and Nahar’s demands to El are agreed, second, Anat threatens El if a house is not built for Baal (but note El originally refuses Baal), third, El mourns the death of Baal at the hands of Mot and was “unable” to do anything, it is Anat who rescues Baal. John W. Miller, “God as Father in the Bible and the Father Image in Several Ancient Near Eastern Myths: A Comparison,” *SR* 14.3 (1985): 349-50.

⁷⁵ For the translation “shoot” for *yr* see, Mark S. Smith, *The Ritual and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods of KTU/CAT 1.23: Royal Constructions of Opposition, Intersection, Integration and Domination* (SBLRBS 51; Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, 2006), 22. The image is of killing the bird, perhaps with a staff, but more likely with a bow and arrow. More typical of throwing a spear would be *šlh* “to stretch, throw, or to send”; Gregorio del Olmo Lete and Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language*, 816. The nominal form in Ugaritic means a type of weapon, *šlh* (*KTU* 1.14 I 20). For an earlier discussion on this text, and the suggestion that it is a bow and arrow, see Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 23.

⁷⁶ The context and the interpretation of shooting the bird as a continuation of the sexual act is likely; Mark S. Smith, *The Ritual and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods*, 88. Therefore, any act of El reminiscent of his divine warrior side is overshadowed by other concerns.

weapons of El are not used for battle.⁷⁷ Unlike Baal, for El, weapons take a background role and at the most function as symbols of kingship that only become used in incidental ways.

El's status is also evident when he can easily be manipulated throughout the Cycle. Any semblance of El's absolute kingship is compromised since he has no power to change the narrative direction initiated by the other characters. For example, when Anat visits El, she threatens him and then he complies with her demands (*KTU* 1.3 IV 30-33). The same occurs in the already mentioned passage where Baal enters the divine council and the gods, as a result of Baal's speech, including El, lay their heads upon their laps (in shame?) (*KTU* 1.2 I 23-25). The power of El is as a figurehead, but the movers and shakers of the text, those who advance the narrative, are the "younger" deities like Baal, Yamm, Mot and especially the female deities.⁷⁸ El maintains the symbols of his power of an earlier time, but they are no longer used to their potential.

Yet the scribes of the Baal cycle were not willing to dispense with the traditional epithets of El in favor of Baal. There is a concern for maintaining El as head king. The reason for this is that Baal is taking over the kingship of El by writing Baal into a position of kingship without denying El's role. Smith constructs this as Baal replacing El as king in a succession type structure.⁷⁹ As evidence Smith draws attention to the significance of

⁷⁷ The image of the bow and arrow was known elsewhere in the ANE as an ideal image of kingship. *šiltāhu* was not only a normal arrow, but referred to the arrow of the king thus reflecting the arrow of Marduk (CAD, Š/2, 448-450. See the bow of Marduk in E.E. 6: 88 ff). It was the arrow (and bow) granted to the king by the ideal warrior god Marduk, as a type of divine appointment and acknowledgement of human kingship.

⁷⁸ Note the following discussion of women's relevance in the Baal Cycle by Marjo C. A. Korpel, "Exegesis in the Work of Ilimiku of Ugarit," *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel: Papers read at the Tenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en België held at Oxford, 1997* (ed. J.C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86-111.

⁷⁹ The position that Baal is taking over El's kingship is presented as an indisputable point in Daniel Schwemer, "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Part II," *JANER* 8.1 (2008): 11-12. Noting

kingship as a theme in the Baal Cycle, to Baal as the patron deity of Ugarit, and to the importance of Baal as the god of rain. Thus, the Cycle “re-contextualiz[ed] the popular meteorological notion of Baal by dramatizing that it was through Baal’s kingship—and implicitly the kingship of the human king whom Baal patronized—that the fertility of the rains would be ensured”.⁸⁰ Whatever the reason for this complex history, the point is that early YHWHism corresponds more to Baal than to El. Further, El’s influence on YHWH cannot account for the universalism and absolute kingship that, as we will see, is rooted in YHWH as creator king in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship.

The Absence of the Warrior Motif in the Psalms of YHWH’s Kingship

Unlike the nuanced view of multiple kingships with different spheres of authority, the majority of scholarship assumes a universalistic vision of YHWH’s kingship throughout the HB. While such a perspective is evident in the hopeful vision of its final editors, how did YHWH’s kingship develop to this point if other forms of divine kingship in the ANE expressed a series of interdependent limited kingships?

One preliminary approach to this question asks whether the language of YHWH’s kingship in the Psalms corresponds to, or is different from, the language of YHWH’s kingship in earlier HB texts and Ugaritic texts of Baal’s kingship. As the chart on the following pages demonstrates, the typical warrior language evident in Baal’s kingship

the limited nature of Baal’s kingship in the Cycle and comparing Baal’s kingship to Israelite and Mesopotamian literature, Smith identifies a theme of “regular royal succession” [UBC II, 17] in which Baal is taking over the kingship of El. Thus Smith compares the Baal Cycle to 1 Kings 1, where Adonijah and Solomon are successors for the throne. After Solomon is appointed, David and Solomon are both referred to as king, which will end with the death of David. For Smith, the exception is in the mythological world of the Baal Cycle: death is not a reality and thus El remains as king. Perhaps more is occurring in maintaining two kingships rather than the difference between human and divine worlds. Other texts reinforce this double kingship. Anat approaches El for a temple to be built for Baal (*KTU* 1.3 V 29-44). Here Anat clearly admits the rulership of El (1.30;35). Yet this does not mean that Baal is taking over the kingship of El. This is clear when Baal is the only king: *mlkn aliyn bʿl ʾtptn / in dʿlnh* “Our king is Mighty Baal, Our ruler with none above him”. While Baal is rising in status, multiple kingships are acceptable without Baal overtaking El’s kingship.

⁸⁰ Smith, UBC II, 16.

and in the earliest poems of Israelite tradition is not prevalent in the YHWH-as-king Psalms. To establish a norm of warrior kingship language, we take representative language of the warrior tradition that is present in texts from Ugarit and the HB to provide an overview of the language used of kings in Canaanite and Levantine cultures. Therefore, all the selected texts explicitly refer to the deity's kingship. These texts include Baal's kingship and specifically his battles with Mot and Yamm in *KTU* 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4. In addition, we survey texts of the HB well known for their warrior-king imagery of YHWH such as: Exod 15:1-18, Deut 32 and 33, Ps 29, Judg 5 and Hab 3. To compare these texts with the Psalms, the first three vertical columns are HB or Ugaritic texts that refer to the warrior tradition and are organized under "anthropomorphic features", "descriptive terms" and "actions of war". Each box collected under these subcategories gathers representative references to the warrior tradition for each category. Finally, the far right column notes any parallels that Pss 93, 96-99 have with the language of the warrior traditions in any of the corresponding columns. While there may be features of the warrior tradition particular to each text not included here, this representative analysis selects examples that overlap and thus constitute a repeated expression of the warrior king in the west.

Warrior Kingship Language in the Levant	Parallels in the Psalms of YHWH's Kingship
---	--

<u>Anthropomorphic Features</u>	<u>Descriptive Terms</u>	<u>Actions of War</u>	
KTU 1.2 IV 20-27 Baal fights Yamm the god of the sea, leading to kingship.		Exod 15:5 YHWH uses the sea to cover Pharaoh's army	Ps 93:3-4 נְהַרְוֹת YHWH is more powerful than "the rivers" and then kingship is pronounced.
Exod 15:3 אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה "Man of war" KTU 1.3 IV 7-8 ʿalʿiyn qrdm "Mightiest of warriors"	Exod 15:2 וַיִּהְיֶה לִּי לִישׁוּעָה "he is salvation for me" Deut 32:15 צוּר יִשְׁעָתוֹ "rock of salvation"	Exod 15:4 יִרֶה "to shoot, throw" KTU 1.2 IV 21-23 hlm "to strike"	Ps 96:2; Ps 98:2 יִשְׁוּעָתוֹ "his salvation"
Exod 15:6; 12; 16 יְמִינְךָ יְהוָה "Your right hand YHWH" KTU 1.2 IV 13 bd bʿl ⁸¹ "in Baal's hand"	Exod 15:7 גִּאוֹןְךָ "your pride" חֲרֹן "your fury"	Exod 15:7 הָרַס "to destroy" Exod. 15:5 יָרַד "to sink" KTU 1.2 IV 21-23 yprsh "to sink" Judges 5:31 אָבַד "to perish" KTU 1.2 IV 27 ykly "to destroy"	Ps 98:1 הוֹשִׁיעָה-לּוֹ יְמִינוֹ וְזִרְעוֹ קִדְשׁוֹ "his right hand and holy arm save"
Exod 15:6; Ps 29:4 כֹּחַ "strength"	Exod 15:2 עֹז "strength"	Exod 15:9 אֲרֹדְךָ "I pursue" אֲשִׁיג	Ps 93:1 עֹז "strength"

⁸¹ Smith's vocalization of *bādi balʿi*, is based on the vocalization of EA 245:35 *ba-di-u*. Here he contracts the vowels in *bi-yadi*. Smith, UBC I, 322. The same phrase regarding Baal's hand in war is in KTU 1.2 IV 21, 24

	Exod 15:13 עֶז “might” <i>KTU</i> 1.6 VI 17-20 ז “strong, fierce”	“I overtake” אֶחֱלֶק שָׁלָל “I divide spoil”	
Ps 29 קוֹל יְהוָה “voice of YHWH” representing the thunder and the storm Judg 5:4b גַּם-שָׁמַיִם נָטְפוּ גַּם-עָבִים נָטְפוּ מִיָּם “Also the heavens dropped, as well the clouds dropped water”	Exod 15:8 and Deut 32:22 אַף “anger”	Exodus 15: 9 and Judges 5:13 אֹיֵב “enemy” <i>KTU</i> 1.2 IV 9 ⁸² <i>srtk</i> “your enemy”	Ps 97:4 בָּרֶק lightning Ps 97:3 refers to fire destroying foes.
	Exod 15:4; Judg 5:4; Ps 29:3-6 The shaking earth due to the presence of YHWH	Exod 15:9 חֶרֶב “sword” <i>KTU</i> 1.2. I 39 <i>mšḥt</i> “a striker” <i>KTU</i> 1.2 IV 4 <i>ḥrbm</i> “sword” <i>KTU</i> 1.2 IV 16 <i>yrtqš ṣmd bd bʿl</i> “the weapon (<i>ṣmd</i>) springs from Baal’s hand”	
	Fear of YHWH Hab 3:2 יִרָא Exod 5:16 אִי־מֶתָה וּפְחַד “terror and dread”		Ps 96:4 נֹרָא “to be feared”

⁸² Other texts of the Baal Cycle also refer to Baal’s enemies. In *KTU* 1.2 IV 39 the enemy to which the speaker refers is not apparent since the text is fragmentary. More clear example of the enemies of Baal are *KTU* 1.4 VII 35-39

There are some parallels to the warrior language in the Psalms. That admitted, the striking absence of warrior language in these Psalms, compared to its constant and consistent repetition in the wide variety of early HB texts and Ugaritic material, demonstrates that the Psalms are not simply a rearticulation of YHWH's kingship as it is represented in early poetry and its Canaanite background. Another feature of warrior language that will be more fully discussed in chapter 2 is YHWH's association with a specific geographic locale and YHWH's rule according to a particular geographic scope. This is evident in Exod 15:14-15 in the areas affected by YHWH and also in Exodus 15:17 in the holy mountain. Likewise, the place of YHWH's origin is mentioned in Judg 5:4, 5. Further, Ps 29 identifies specific geographical locations and who benefits from YHWH's presence (Ps 29:6, 8). Likewise, Hab 3:3 identifies the origin of YHWH and, like Exod 15, identifies the intended beneficiaries of YHWH's kingship in Hab 3:7. This feature will be discussed later since the localized vision of YHWH in early material strongly contrasts with the universalism of YHWH's kingship in Pss 93, 96-99. While there are elements of the warrior tradition in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, they are significantly reduced. Thus there is a difference between the expression of the kingship of YHWH in the early poetry and that found in the YHWH kingship Psalms. Whereas the limited kingship is present in the early material, no indication of a limited kingship is expressed in Pss 93, 96-99. Rather, the early poetry fits well with an early Canaanite expression of limited spheres of authority, multiple kingships of competing gods, with YHWH primarily informed by a Baal tradition.

The task of this study is to understand the differences between the expressions of YHWH's kingship at different stages in Israelite history. Once those differences are

established, for the first time, this study will account for those changes. To do this, we will apply the notion of cultural translation. The application of this method, combined with a careful analysis of development in the notion of Marduk's kingship, leads to a hypothesis that YHWH's kingship was affected by a similar type of Assyrian pressure experienced by Marduk's expression in Babylon.

Chapter Two: Stages of YHWH's Kingship in Ancient Israel

As demonstrated in the last chapter, previous studies constructed the monarchical lens as the singular context for expressions of YHWH's kingship. For them, all the facets of YHWH's kingship (universal king, judge, creator, warrior) are present in each text. This position requires refinement since not all expressions of YHWH's kingship share a typical vocabulary and Pss 93, 96-99 are a deviation from YHWH as the warrior king. With attention to diachronic developments known in other aspects of scholarship on YHWH's divinity, the following analysis demonstrates there are at least two distinct stages of YHWH's kingship.

In the first part, we examine the more developed–accepted construction–of the YHWH kingship Psalms, extrapolate its particular vision of YHWH's kingship, and situate its expression in the more universal vision of the Jerusalem temple. In the second part, we offer the first thorough analysis of an early corpus of YHWH kingship texts (Exod 15:1-18; Deut 33:5; Num 23:21; and Ps 29).⁸³ While these latter texts have been studied as early poetry, they have yet to be analyzed for how they express an early stage

⁸³ Since this study is interested in categorizing and identifying the motivations for shifts in YHWH's kingship, only the early corpus and the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are discussed in detail. Other passages of YHWH's kingship do not upset nor more substantially support the analysis here. For example, while chapter 5 will give some attention to First-Isaiah, the absence of Isaiah 6 as a major text for discussion is merely because the text does not reveal much about YHWH's kingship. It describes YHWH as king, describes the heavenly hosts, but is more focused on the passing of YHWH's word and presence to the prophet. This is similar to texts like Mal 1:14. Other texts like 1 Sam 8:7; 12:12 show that YHWH's kingship was a concern, but do not reveal what that kingship is and are not as relevant for establishing earlier and later forms. Post-exilic texts are also not discussed in detail since they occur after the shift identified in this study. For example, post-exilic texts like Jer 8:19; 10:7, 10; 46:18; 48:15; 51:57 demonstrate that after the shift, a kingship theology, especially a universal one (Jer 10:7), was well-developed thanks to the YHWH kingship Psalms. Likewise, YHWH's kingship is well used in Second-Isaiah (Isa 41:21; 43:15; 44:6; 52:7) and reinforces the universalistic vision of the Psalms. These post-exilic works not discussed here show that the kingship of the Psalms influences later texts like Zech 14:9, 16, 17 and 1 Chr 16:31, 29:11; 2 Chr 9:8; 20:6. Then Zeph 3:15; Mic 2:13; 4:7 will be discussed briefly in chapter five for how they correspond to our more detailed analysis of First-Isaiah.

of YHWH's kingship as different from latter stages of that kingship. We will reinforce the generally agreed early dates of this early corpus, uncover how YHWH's kingship is envisioned at these earliest stages, and articulate how the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are an intentional deviation from the expression of YHWH's kingship in the early corpus. Recognizing two distinct stages establishes the question for later chapters: what motivated the change in YHWH's kingship?

Part I: The Psalms of YHWH's Kingship

As reviewed in the last chapter, one of the primary influences on the current constructions of YHWH's kingship was Mowinckel. He set the Psalms of YHWH's kingship in the *Sitz im Leben* of the Jerusalem cult during the enthronement festival in which the divine king was re-enthroned.⁸⁴ No attempt is made here to refine that hypothesis, which continues to seem reasonable, if at times speculative. It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate critically the details of Mowinckel's thesis, nor does the validity of this study depend on those details.⁸⁵ The primary purpose is to discuss what type of YHWH king those Psalms describe, so that type can be compared with YHWH's kingship in other texts of the HB.

Assuming a geographical origin (or eventual home in their current form) for these Psalms in Jerusalem is complex and is linked to problems in dating the Psalms.⁸⁶ While

⁸⁴ Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (trans. D.R. Ap-Thomas; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), 108. Lipiński has a helpful and comprehensive review of scholarship up until 1969. Rather than a mere chronological review of scholarship, it is helpfully organized into interpretation, théologique, historiques, eschatologique and mythico-culturelles and hisorico-culturelles; Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé*, 11-90. For a discussion of Jerusalem as the cultic centre in relation to these Psalms, particularly Ps 93, consult Lipiński's discussion of Jerusalem as a symbolic centre of the created universe as in other myths; see, Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé*, 118-122.

⁸⁵ See later in this chapter for a defense of the general notion that these Psalms emanate for Jerusalem and share a similar date and theology.

⁸⁶ Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé*, 157-73, thinks Ps 93 is from the time of Solomon but moves its form-critical location to the Songs of Zion; Other YHWH kingship Psalms he dates late. For Lipiński's date

Psalms dating is at present in a methodological flux, the purpose here is neither to review the traditional linguistic dating of these texts (both the Psalms and the earlier texts) nor to propose a new analysis of this method. We accept some limitations of former linguistic dating, but maintain that linguistic dating in dialogue with other critical methodologies can indicate a relative date for biblical texts.⁸⁷

Linguistically, Brettler and Howard argue convincingly for a pre-exilic date to the Psalms using traditional linguistic dating informed by Hurovitz and Cross/Freedman respectively.⁸⁸ Contextually, the placement of these Psalms in a Jerusalemite context is

of this Psalm, see Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé*, 172. For a discussion, see John Eaton, *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom*, 94. The gap widens in date when Lipiński considers Ps 97 as a late (164 B.C.E) composition. Yet such a late date is unlikely since many of its features comfortably fit into an earlier date. This contrasts with his dating of Ps 99 as pre-exilic.

⁸⁷ Newer approaches to linguistic dating are a challenge to older methods, but they have not yet offered a concrete methodology for proceeding. This study will thus follow traditional criteria for linguistic dating. Traditional linguistic dating methods organize forms into archaic, standard and late biblical Hebrew (ABH, SBH, LBH): ABH is anything pre-1000 B.C.E, SBH belongs to Iron Age II (1000-586 B.C.E.) and LBH is Persian origin (515-332 B.C.E.): Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). There are recent criticisms of this traditional school. See for example Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, Martin Ehrensverd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (London: Equinox, 2009); Ian Young, "Biblical Texts Cannot be Dated Linguistically," *HS* (2005): 341-51. For these scholars, the diachronic dating of texts by linguistic means is impossible due to the following: the large amount of linguistic variation in texts supposedly representative of a time period, the problems of text-criticism and differences between the versions (having a secure text from which to assess linguistic features), and finally the complexities of redacted units. Young concludes that various forms could have been produced at the same time. Yet this conclusion is not based on any new information; it remains a hypothesis. Newer forms of linguistic dating—informed by more attention to linguistics as a field apart from Hebraic studies—have been appearing in response to the criticisms of linguistic dating. Emerging methods of linguistic dating wish to go beyond older models and answer the Young school in particular. It is too early to know how these new types of linguistic dating will develop. Their current formulations are mostly in scholarly presentations and on-line: Robert D. Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew"; John Cook, "Detecting Development in Biblical Hebrew using Diachronic Typology." Both are forthcoming in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* edited by Zion Zevit and Cynthia L. Miller. This study agrees with the critique of Young that an absolute or relative dating based solely on the linguistic method cannot be certain. That admitted one need not propose relative dates for entire biblical books; rather, individual units can still be studied as they were in the past.

⁸⁸ Brettler, informed by Hurovitz, notes that all the Psalms with post-exilic markers are found in book V (Psalms 107-150) rather than book IV of the Psalter (Psalms 90-106); Marc Z. Brettler, *God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor* (JSOTSup 76; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 148-149, 156. Howard also dates these Psalms to the post-9th centuries. David M. Howard, *The Structure of Psalms 93-100* (BJS 5; Winona Lake, IN; Eisenbrauns, 1997), 184-192.

evident in the work of Mowinckel and Eaton.⁸⁹ The older position was to assume that these Psalms were post-exilic due to a lack of reference to Davidic kings.⁹⁰ Some date the enthronement Psalms late since early Israel did not have an imperialistic model through which to express universal kingship of YHWH.⁹¹ Yet Israel need not have had its own imperialistic aims to express YHWH's kingship in universal terms. There is ample evidence that Israel was exposed to Assyrian imperialism during the pre-exilic period.⁹² This study will continue to explore why Jerusalem is a suitable context for these Psalms. That context will also be reinforced in our last chapter as the most appropriate one in which changes to YHWH's kingship took place.⁹³

In the broadest possible inclusion, the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are Pss 29, 47, 93, 95-99.⁹⁴ This list is born from modifications of and reactions to Mowinckel's

⁸⁹ Mowinckel's placement of these Psalms in the Jerusalemite cult retains acceptance. For a review of Mowinckel's contribution to the autumn festival and its setting in a pre-exilic context in Jerusalem based on shifts in calendar practice evident in the HB, see. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, 102-104.

⁹⁰ Delitzsch saw Pss 93, 97 and 99 as post-exilic given these connections to Second-Isaiah. Franz Delitzsch, *Die Psalmen* (5th ed., Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1894). For a full discussion of Delitzsch's contribution to these Psalms, see John Eaton, *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom: A Conference with Commentators* (JSOTSupp 199; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 56-57. For example, Tate believes Pss 96-99 are post-exilic but cautions against past assumptions that use parallels to Isaiah 40-55 to make their case. Tate, *Psalms 51-100*, 505.

⁹¹ Gerstenberger, "'World Domination' in Yahweh Kingship Psalms," 192-210.

⁹² Roberts also argues that Israel was in the shadow of multiple imperial powers, particularly Egypt. J. J. M. Roberts, "Mowinckel's Enthronement Festival," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. Peter W. Flint and Patrick D. Miller; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 110-11.

⁹³ Another indication of these Psalms pre-exilic setting is by scholars who place the poems of the HB along a trajectory, thus recognizing the date of some Psalms dealing with YHWH's kingship are not the same as in the earlier texts. For Craigie's position, see Peter C. Craigie, "Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition," *VT* 22 (1972): 143-151. Likewise, Jeremias recognizes development and identifies early statements of God's reign in Ps 47, 68, Deut 33, Exod 15 (and here we could add Ps 29); Jörg Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen* (FRLANT 141; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987). Yet his further division of Psalms 95 and 99 related to DtrH, 96 and 98 related to Deutero-Isaiah, and Psalm 97 as Hellenistic are problematic. Eaton has already demonstrated that the relation of the Psalms' dating to the time of Deutero-Isaiah, assuming the latter is a pre-cursor, is based on the older view that all great ideas stemmed from the prophets. Eaton, *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom*, 118. The relevant parallels are: Ps 98:1 // Isa 42:10; 52:10; 59:16; 63:5; Ps 98:3 // Isa 40:5; 52:10; 66:18; Ps 98:4 // Isa 52:9; Ps 98: 5 // Isa 51:3; Ps 98:7 // Isa 55:12.

⁹⁴ Watts has developed form-critical criteria to classify the YHWH kingship Psalms. They are as follows: 1) concern for all the earth, 2) references to other gods, 3) signs of exaltation and kingship, and 4)

original assertion of the enthronement Pss as 47, 93, 95-99, 100.⁹⁵ The list varies if one studies the canonical shaping of the Psalms in book IV, of which most of these Psalms are a part, or studies individual Psalms and their form-critical elements.⁹⁶ While the trend of Psalms scholarship is now to discuss their canonical arrangement, this analysis will study the individual Psalms' descriptions of YHWH's kingship in order to establish what type of divinity they propose.⁹⁷ Psalm 29 is a special case we will study later in this chapter. The Psalms of YHWH's kingship are selected first, based on their explicit references to YHWH's kingship (lacking in Ps 94 and Ps 100) and the shared motifs of that kingship: universal, creator, judge. For example, Ps 100 and Ps 68 have sometimes been included due to the former's canonical proximity to the other Psalms and due to the latter's echo of warrior language. Yet neither Psalm states that YHWH is king. Therefore, this study will examine Pss 93, 95-99 as the YHWH kingship Psalms.⁹⁸

acts of YHWH: judge, 5) expressions of praise to YHWH (James D.W. Watts "Yahweh Malak Psalms," *ThZ* 21 (1965): 341-48). To this list, I add that YHWH's kingship must be explicitly stated. This additional criterion negates Psalms like Ps 94 from the analysis. While various texts have echoes and allusions to YHWH's kingship, this study focuses on specific, clear texts of YHWH's kingship, with form-critical connections. Helpfully, these Psalms have already been gathered together in their canonical form.

⁹⁵ As discussed in chapter 1, Mowinckel built upon Gunkel's understanding of the royal Psalms. Gunkel was thus one of the first to express skepticism over Mowinckel's new classification of these Psalms; Hermann Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms: Genres of Religious Lyric of Israel* (trans. J. D. Nogalski; GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 69-77. More recently, see Allan R. Petersen, *The Royal God: Enthronement Festivals in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (JSOTSup 259; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

⁹⁶ Tate suggests reading Pss 90-100 together (Marvin Tate, *Psalm 51-100* [Dallas: Word Books, 1990], xxvi) whereas Howard divides book IV into three sections: Pss 90-94, 95-100, 100-106 (David Howard, "A Contextual Reading of Psalms 90-94" in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* [ed. J.C. McCann; JSOTSup 159; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 109).

⁹⁷ Canonical readings of the Psalms are evident in recent works such as: Robert Cole, *The Shape and Message of Book III* (Psalms 73-89) (JSOTSup 307; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Gerald Wilson, "Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise," in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter* (ed. J. Clinton McCann; JSOTSup 159; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 42-51; and Hubert J. Kenner, "A Canonical Exegesis of the Eighth Psalm: YHWH's Maintenance of the Created Order Through Divine Reversal" (PhD diss., Baylor University, 2010).

⁹⁸ Psalm 47 will be given minimal treatment and most often in the footnotes. The Psalm lacks some major themes present in the other Psalms of YHWH's kingship. Furthermore, it is not as detailed as the other Psalms and is slightly removed from them form-critically. We accept Ps 47 could be earlier than the other psalms of YHWH's kingship but that it is of limited use for reconstructing the kingship of YHWH around Jerusalem. For Roberts' discussion of Ps 47 as a Psalm of David's reign, see J. J. M. Roberts, "The

The Sphere of YHWH's Kingship in Psalms 93, 95-99

Psalm 95 is an apt introduction to these Psalms since it possesses aspects common throughout them. First, the Psalm echoes older traditions, a feature we will examine in these Psalms.⁹⁹ It remembers the Meribah and Massah account that was probably written down in the monarchical period, but applies that situation to some current reality (Ps 95:11), possibly an anticipation of, or reflection on, deportation.¹⁰⁰ Perhaps echoes of the Meribah/Massah event are also evident in calling YHWH: צֹרֵר יִשְׁעֵנוּ (v.1).¹⁰¹ Second, the kingship of YHWH is clearly stated (95:3) and the Psalmist demonstrates that kingship is rooted in YHWH the creator (95:4-5). Third, YHWH as the source of salvation is also

Religio-Political Setting of Psalm 47,” *BASOR* 221 (1976): 129-132. There are other Psalms that refer to YHWH's kingship, often by limited references; these sometimes correspond to the warrior tradition (Ps 68:14-25), at other times to the more universal idea of YHWH (Ps 22:28), and still at other times to part of the liturgy (Ps 24:7-9). The Psalms of YHWH's kingship are selected for detailed study since they are a sustained, form-critically united examination on the kingship of YHWH. The remaining are sporadic references to YHWH's kingship, demonstrate that the metaphor is important in liturgical and prayer life, but do not offer any more detail beyond the Psalms of YHWH's kingship for understanding the major stages of YHWH's kingship and the reason for their change. The remaining Psalms references are: Pss 5:3; 10:16; 28; 44:5; 74:12; 103:19; 145:1, 11-13; 146:10; 149:2

⁹⁹ Willem S. Prinsloo, “Psalm 95: If Only You Will Listen to His Voice!,” in *The Bible in Human Society: A Festschrift in Honor of J. Rogerson* (ed. M.D. Carroll, D.J. Clines, P. R. Davies; JSOTSup 200; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 393-96.

¹⁰⁰ The LXX communicates this penitential sense of the Psalm that could anticipate exile as a result of communal sin. In Ps 95:6-7 the worshippers come to the temple and the LXX translates kneeling (נִבְרַכָּה) as καὶ κλαύσωμεν “we will weep.” Thus, even approaching YHWH's temple for the LXX translator anticipates vv. 8-11. In general, the LXX of the Psalms is considered a literal rendering of its *Vorlage*; see Albert Pietersma, ed. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 542-547. The notes here will not give detailed attention to the text-criticism of the LXX. While not a text-critical edition, Rahlfs remains the most complete version for the Psalms and is the one on which the NETS translation is based and which we use here for the Psalms; Alfred Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum X; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967). In these footnotes references are to the Psalm number and versification in the MT, not the LXX; also Ps 94 in the LXX equals Ps 95 in the MT.

¹⁰¹ Here the LXX likely eliminates the reference to “rock” rather than representing its *Vorlage*. In Ps 95:1 it reads: σωτήρι ἡμῶν. The reference to “rock” makes more sense in the poem given the event being referenced. Further, commonly the LXX eliminates the term “rock” (צֹרֵר or אֶבֶן) when it is in a genitival relationship with another term. For example, see Gen 29:24. Especially, the specific term “rock of salvation” is always eliminated: Deut 32:15 reads צֹרֵר יִשְׁעֵנוּ (4Q141 יֵן צֹרֵר) while the LXX reads σωτήρος αὐτοῦ: 1 Sam 2:22 reads צֹרֵר בְּאֵלֵינוּ in the LXX is οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος πλὴν σοῦ. The broad elimination of rock across wide ranges of translational activity in the LXX, indicates it was a common feature of their translation. Even in the Psalms, rather than use “rock” to describe YHWH, it prefers the features of the rock, as in Ps 18:3.

given a location. The general source of most of the Psalms of YHWH's kingship in the Jerusalem context is well accepted.¹⁰² The setting of the temple is implied in vv. 1-5 with this proclamation of YHWH and the entering of the temple in vv. 6-7. While this Psalm could have origins outside Jerusalem, it was likely comfortably used for Jerusalem temple worship. Further, the kingship of YHWH is centered on the temple (95:2) and this implies a time of Jerusalemite expression.¹⁰³ As we will see, the location of kingship in Jerusalem does not limit kingship, but gives a locale from which universal kingship emerges. These Psalms express a broad sense, and attempt a new vision of kingship that does not root YHWH's saving acts in a warrior kingship like that of Baal, but in something else entirely.

To understand the new vision of kingship, we must realize how these Psalms are developed from older traditions. Psalm 95 echoes the divine council origins of YHWH's kingship, perhaps like the scene presented in Ps 82. While the Psalm echoes this tradition, it shifts the focus to whom YHWH's kingship is directed. For the Psalmist, the kingship is less about reference to the other gods, and more about the people of Israel, as evident in 95:7-10.¹⁰⁴ As we will see, the primary focus of YHWH's kingship here and in these Psalms is upon the world as a result of YHWH's kingship rooted in creation, rather than upon the gods in charge of separate spheres of authority.

¹⁰² This was demonstrated in much of Mowinckel's work. More recently, Eaton has continued to reinforce a Jerusalemite context for many of the Psalms; John Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms* (Sheffield: JSOT Press; 1986); John Eaton, *The Psalms Come Alive: Capturing the Voice and Art of Israel's Songs* (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984), 4, 8.

¹⁰³ For a history of scholarship on Psalm 95, see Prinsloo, "Psalm 95," 393-96.

¹⁰⁴ This could be an addition to the Psalm. Traditionally, the original unity of the Psalm is in question given a division made between vv. 1-7a and 7b-11. Here we agree with Zenger and Hossfeld that the contrast between the first section dealing with YHWH and the gods, and the second section focusing upon YHWH's kingship for the people, is intentional: Zenger and Hossfeld, *Psalms* 2, 459-60. This is further evidence that the intentional direction of Pss 93, 95-99 is to move away from older expressions of YHWH's kingship to a newer formulation. In this case, the focus of YHWH's kingship with the people lessens the role of the other gods and sets up the expansion of YHWH's rule to all peoples that occurs in Ps 96.

Psalm 96 is a good indication of how and where these Psalms direct YHWH's kingship.¹⁰⁵ While there is a reference to the other gods in 96:4, and even that YHWH is to be feared (Niphal) above all gods, it moves beyond the divine council for contextualizing YHWH as king. Psalm 96:4 states that all the gods fear YHWH, but immediately 96:5 negates their effectiveness: **כִּי כָל־אֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֵל יִלִּים**.¹⁰⁶

In a context of the ineffectiveness of the other gods, the sphere of YHWH's kingship in 96:7-10 is not limited to the temple. YHWH's kingship is not even limited to Israel. Rather the families of the peoples are invited to come to YHWH: **הָבֹו לַיהוָה מִשְׁפְּחוֹת עַמִּים** (v. 7). If there is any doubt whether this group is beyond Israel, it is made explicit that the families of Israel are not the only ones intended. First, while **מִשְׁפְּחוֹת** can mean many things, it does not have to be restricted to the tribes of Israel. Other HB references use **מִשְׁפְּחוֹת** in a broader sense.¹⁰⁷ Second, the scope widens as the poem progresses. Indeed **כָּל־הָאָרֶץ** will bow down and writhe before YHWH's glory (96:9). Finally, in v. 10, even the **גּוֹיִם** proclaim YHWH's kingship and thus reinforce the scope of that kingship.¹⁰⁸

There is no indication how the Psalmist imagines these foreigners' relationship to YHWH; it could be the vision of Second-Isaiah where they come in chains before YHWH (Isa 45:14; 49:23), or it could be the vision of Third-Isaiah (Isa 56:7b) where they are equally accepted in worship. Despite the lack of clarity over exactly how the

¹⁰⁵ Like Ps 95, this Psalm is late pre-exilic. If the reference to YHWH's glory in v.3 is any indication, it could reflect a time before Ezekiel who develops this **כְּבוֹד** theology in anticipatory response to exile.

¹⁰⁶ The LXX uses δαίμόνια "demons".

¹⁰⁷ For example, see Num 26:5-62; Ezk 20:32; Zech 14:17-18. In the Ezekiel example the use of "families" is parallel with **גּוֹיִם**. Further, in Zechariah it is in a context of YHWH's kingship and refers to all families and in v.18 is made explicit as the "families of Egypt" **מִשְׁפְּחוֹת מִצְרַיִם**.

¹⁰⁸ The LXX levels all terms related to the peoples; instead of distinguishing Gentile (v.10) from "families" (v. 7), it translates all as ἔθνος.

foreign nations are imagined in relation to Israel in the psalm, the kingship of YHWH affects those beyond the scope of the Jerusalem cult. Perhaps one can imagine a situation of equality, since YHWH's rule is over the entire world and he comes to judge all people. To emphasize the universalistic kingship intended, the broad sphere of king as judge is repeated twice in the conclusion of the Psalm (96:13).¹⁰⁹

The introduction of universal kingship in Ps 97:5b, while returning to the vision of other gods, furthers this trajectory and shows that YHWH's kingship extends over the whole earth (v. 9). The **אֱלֹהִים רַבִּים** that are called to rejoice (97:1), both in its parallelism with **הָאָרֶץ** and in its implication distant shores of the known world, implies YHWH's broad rule.¹¹⁰ YHWH's universal kingship is maintained throughout this Psalm. Psalm 98 returns to the ideas of Ps 96 and explores the effect of kingship, not limited to Israel, but revealed to **הַגּוֹיִם** (v. 2). Psalm 99 maintains the sphere of kingship and returns to a Jerusalemite locale from which universal kingship emerges.¹¹¹

The Creator-King

How do these Psalms reinforce that universalism? Consider the way Ps 96 negates the presence of other gods. It does not just state YHWH's universal rule by claiming that the gods are idols, it demonstrates that universalism with reference to an important tradition. Rather than establishing YHWH's power over the gods by re-appropriating the warrior tradition, the Psalms root YHWH's kingship in something else entirely. Psalm 96:5 says: "Because all the gods of the people are idols, but YHWH made the heavens"

¹⁰⁹ For a further analysis, see Philippus J. Botha, "The 'Enthronement Psalms': A Claim to the World-wide Honour of Yahweh," *OTE* 11 (1998): 24-39.

¹¹⁰ Tate (*Psalms 51-100*, 516) calls attention to the use of the term **אֱלֹהִים** in Isa 40:15; 41:5; 66:19; Jer 31:10.

¹¹¹ The location of Jerusalem as an ideal space to express universalism is evident in Ps 87 where Jerusalem is described a world-mother (**יְרוּשָׁלַיִם יְלֵד־בְּרֵה**) (Ps 87:4,5). Psalm 47 also contains various aspects of this universalism (Ps 47:2-4; 10b).

כי כל-אלהי העמים אל ילים ויהוה עשה שמים.¹¹² The proof of this new kingship is evident because YHWH made the heavens. Creation is called upon as the primary evidence to demonstrate kingship and YHWH's absolute rule. The role of a creator king is the primary way these Psalms demonstrate universalism.

Psalm 93 begins by establishing the kingship of YHWH and showing YHWH is superior to creation (vv. 2, 3-4) since he established the world (93:1). Similarly, Ps 95 is not content merely to state YHWH's role as creator, but reflects on what that means in regards to the kingship of YHWH. It is a creator who has control over all creation. In 95:4 “in his hand are the depths of the earth and the towering¹¹³ mountains belong to him.”¹¹⁴ Likewise, v. 5 emphasizes the role of YHWH in creation: his is the sea he made (עשה) “and the dry land (בשת) his hands fashion (יצר).”

Psalm 96 more explicitly links creation and kingship. Here kingship is related to the state of the world in 96:5. Thus the תבל (v. 10 and v. 13 as well) does not shake but stands firm because of YHWH's kingship (v. 10). These Psalms employ a different rhetoric distinguishing them from earlier poems of YHWH's kingship. The emphasis has

¹¹² Psalm 97:7-8 has a similar rhetoric.

¹¹³ תועפות is beside “mountains” and both are nouns. The use of תועפות with another noun causes some difficulties. For the translation of the first noun, all uses in the HB appear with an aspect of possession, with the תועפות of the wild ox in Num 23:22; Num 24:8 and the תועפות of silver in Job 22:25. There is little disagreement among the versions what this means. The LXX translates the noun in 95:4 as “height” ὕψος, Tg. Ket. as רום “height”, and the Peshitta has the same ܐܘܪܝܬܐ. 4Q94 is broken at this section. I understand the two nouns as a hendiadys. For a helpful definition of hendiadys, see Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques* (JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 324. Yet it is not a nominal hendiadys where the two nouns are equated; rather, the nouns are in a genitival relationship, where the head modifies what follows. For this option of a hendiadys, see Nathan Wasserman, *Style and Form in Old Babylonian Literary Texts* (CM 27; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 6-16.

¹¹⁴ Understood with the lamed of possession, especially with the 3ms suffix.

¹¹⁵ This is the alternate narrative lexeme, to the more ancient, poetic form פעל.

clearly shifted from YHWH's kingship informed by a Canaanite form rooted in warrior language, to one where kingship is celebrated in the role of creator. In these Psalms, there is a clear absence of YHWH as a warrior who wins his kingship. For example, in Ps 96:11-12 YHWH does not fight the seas as Baal does, but the seas respond to his already established kingship.

In Ps 97 the creation motif is not explicit. While kingship is firmly established in v. 1 and YHWH's power in the lightning of v. 4, there is no explicit element of the creator god. Yet creation is implied since the whole natural world reacts to YHWH's kingship. It is not just the sea that reacts, as one expects from the storm god Baal, but here the many coastlands (97:1), and in 97:4b all the earth, react to YHWH's power. Such implied creation is also evident in Ps 98:7 where the world of people, rivers and mountains praise YHWH. These Psalms thus meditate upon the effects of that kingship rooted in creation to communicate a universal kingship removed from older vestiges of divine warrior language.¹¹⁶

Transition in the YHWH Kingship Psalms

The difference between the warrior king and the creator king is especially apparent when one expects to find in the YHWH kingship Psalms all the elements of divine kingship expressed in the ANE and particularly the element of YHWH as warrior. Realizing the absence of the warrior element in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, Tanner asks: "How can two motifs that are essential to the Marduk and Baal epics of kingship be missing from the Yahweh enthronement Psalms? Or are they indeed missing?"¹¹⁷ Tanner

¹¹⁶ Psalm 47 lacks reference to YHWH's universalism rooted in the creator-king. Since Psalm 47 does not contain warrior language (v. 4 merely uses the phrase **דבר**) nor roots YHWH kingship in creator language, placing the Psalm is difficult.

¹¹⁷ Tanner, *The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality*, 113.

looks for vestiges of other gods in the text to show that the elements more typical of Baal's battles are present in the YHWH kingship Psalms and not ignored by the Psalmists.¹¹⁸ While there are some vestiges of Baal language in these Psalms, the general absence of the warrior tradition in them is noticeable.

The assimilation of multiple expressions of kingship in these texts highlights the absence of a warrior tradition. While the creator-king is primary in these Psalms, the varieties of other metaphors of divinity suggest that these Psalms are the classical expression of the cultic centre and intentionally gather common expressions of YHWH's kingship for wide acceptance. Just as the ark tradition is gathered into Jerusalem and rarely mentioned again,¹¹⁹ these Psalms collect a variety of expressions for YHWH as king, making them all subservient to the creator-king metaphor. For example, we can consider YHWH as judge in 96:8; 97:8b and 98:9. Similarly, YHWH is the giver of the law in Ps 99:7. These Psalms express YHWH so differently than the early warrior model by including other aspects of kingship without significant reference to the warrior tradition, and by expanding the sphere of kingship, which intentionally de-emphasizes the warrior tradition.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Tanner combines Marduk and Baal in her analysis. We mention only Baal's kingship since something different is occurring with Marduk's kingship that will be explored later.

¹¹⁹ Surprisingly, after the ark is moved from Shiloh to Jerusalem, one would expect the liturgical prayers of the temple (the psalms) to utilize the ark tradition. Yet it is only mentioned twice in the Psalms (Pss 18:11; 99:1). As a moveable sacred space, it could not be ignored, but once it is placed in Jerusalem, the desire to centralize worship takes precedence.

¹²⁰ Scholars have recognized the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are a development from older forms, but this represents a small minority compared to the cohesion sought through expressions of YHWH's kingship as demonstrated in chapter 1. Craigie states: "In the 'Enthronement Psalms,' the Canaanite motifs have undergone more radical transformation and convey a rich theological expression of Israelite religion; the military context is less evident, though to some extent it is implicit in the theme of kingship." Craigie, "Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition," 145. Craigie cites A. E. Combs, ("The Creation Motif in the 'Enthronement Psalms,'" PhD diss., Columbia University, 1963) to demonstrate this. Further, Craigie's study is one of the few that looks at Hebrew poetry in terms of development.

The expressions gathered in these Psalms naturally call for the warrior motif, thus making its absence more obvious. The absence of warrior language where it is expected is apparent in the use of salvific language in the Psalms. The Psalmist links YHWH's kingship in relation to his salvific acts (Pss 96:2; 95:1; 97:10b).¹²¹ While the acts are not specified they no doubt recall the known salvific acts of YHWH in the Exodus tradition. For example, Ps 95 refers to the events of Meribah and Massah, which would clearly recall Israel's time in the desert after the salvific acts of YHWH at the Reed Sea.¹²² Since traditions like the Exodus are typically expressed in warrior language (Exod 15:1-18), it is an obvious gap for the psalmist not to use the warrior motif while recalling YHWH's salvific acts. The psalmist creates this intentional gap to be filled, drawing the reader's attention to the expected warrior language and providing an alternate vision of kingship. This technique re-orientates the worshippers' theological expressions from a warrior and limited kingship, to a more universal-creator kingship.

Despite minor echoes of the warrior-god present in these Psalms (Ps 98:1-2), it is more reflective of the Psalmists' purpose to ask why the warrior tradition is almost absent rather than focus on how that tradition is similar to a Baal model. The focus of YHWH's kingship rooted in creation and the effects of YHWH on that creation, de-emphasize the more typical elements of ordering chaos in other kingship texts internal and external to the HB. There is an intentional de-emphasis of the warrior tradition to an extent that Ps 95 has no references to YHWH the warrior. Likewise, Ps 99 has been noticed for similar features.¹²³ In these Psalms, the kingship of YHWH is expressed independently of the

¹²¹ In the first two examples *יְשׁוּעָה* is used, in the latter, it is *נָצַל*.

¹²² Specifically, the reference to "rock of salvation" in Ps 95:1 would likely recall the same word in Exod 15: 2 *יְשׁוּעָה*.

¹²³ Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé*, 276ff.

warrior YHWH tradition that won such kingship in its earliest forms. If these Psalms date to the pre-exilic period (8th century), one would expect warrior language in the context of mounting Assyrian presence in the Levant. Rather, the new victory of YHWH does not have as its focus the gods or even foreign kings that are defeated, but shifts its orientation to how that victory affects Israel and the entire earth.

Summary of the YHWH Kingship Psalms

Psalms 93, 95-99 expresses a universal creator-king with an absolute kingship.¹²⁴ While these features are partly acknowledged in current scholarship, the preceding discussion has offered a more detailed analysis of their interrelationships, how they are presented, and how they function. These Psalms do not merely repeat earlier forms of divine kingship and plant them in an Israelite context. Rather, they show intentional signs of development away from the features of YHWH among the divine council and in particular away from YHWH as warrior.

Why is kingship expressed differently in these Psalms than other expressions of divine kingship in a Syria-Palestinian context? Some suggest that YHWH underwent development since he eventually took on features of El, including creator elements, contributing to a developed form of YHWH's kingship.¹²⁵ While this remains a possibility, and part of the reason, few have considered complementary explanations. This study will suggest that the new vision in the YHWH-kingship Psalms is best

¹²⁴ Miller and Roberts have expressed this type of YHWH kingship as YHWH rising to the level of imperial rank. Miller and Roberts also place this expression in the Jerusalem cult, agreeing strongly with many aspects of Mowinckel's theory of the enthronement Psalms; Patrick D. Miller, "Israelite Religion," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters* (ed. D.A. Knight and G.M. Tucker; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 220-22; J. J. M. Roberts "The Religio-Political Setting of Psalm 47," *BASOR* 221 (1976): 129-132; J. J. M. Roberts, "God's Imperial Reign According to the Psalter," *HBT* 23 (2001): 211-21.

¹²⁵ John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (JSOTSup 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 13-41; Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 142-48.

contextualized as a response to Assyrian imperialism. The remaining chapters will develop a method suitable for identifying and demonstrating the social conditions that motivated change in YHWH's kingship. Now that these YHWH kingship Psalms have been contextualized as different than early expression of YHWH's kingship, we can now turn to the internal Israelite traditions those kingship Psalms were moving from, and further establish the differences between the two stages of YHWH's kingship. The following discussion establishes an alternate form of YHWH's kingship within the HB that has not received attention as a corpus in its own right. As a result, two stages of YHWH's kingship emerge, from which the present study can then ask why that change occurred.

Part II: The Corpus of YHWH's Early Kingship

A variety of biblical texts (Exod 15:1-18, Num 22, Deut 33:5 and Ps 29) form a corpus of early YHWH kingship texts that are markedly different from the form in the Jerusalem temple. The following discussion will first analyze the centrality of YHWH's kingship in the Song of the Sea and demonstrate the importance of the warrior tradition in that poem. This section will outline the type of YHWH king in this early corpus and demonstrate its limited kingship associated with a warrior tradition. Finally, at select moments a comparative analysis of some Psalms with these early texts will reinforce that the YHWH kingship Psalms are a rhetorical move away from earlier forms of YHWH's kingship.

The Song of the Sea

The Song of the Sea, or Exod 15:1-18, has a long tradition in biblical scholarship as being one of the earliest poems of the HB.¹²⁶ There is a plethora of scholarship on the issue, so we only need summarize why the poem's relative early date remains viable. Under the influence of Albright, Cross and Freedman offered philological reasons for an early date. Yet it was Robertson who solidified their analysis and offered the most convincing arguments for an early date.¹²⁷ Beginning from the premise that most of the poetry from the middle of the 8th century can be given a secure date, calling these standard forms, Robertson reconstructed early Hebrew poetry by correlating suspected early Hebrew poetry with standard poetry on one end and with the "Canaanite glosses" in the Amarna letters on the other. This analysis was combined with attention to archaic forms, appearing in "clusters", also indicative of an early date.¹²⁸ Applying this method,

¹²⁶ We will give more attention to the Song of the Sea since it is a sustained poem on YHWH's kingship and has also attracted the most scholarship. This more sustained discussion then forms a suitable context into which the other early YHWH kingship texts can be situated.

¹²⁷ Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. This began with Albright's work: W.F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: An Historical Analysis of Two Conflicting Faiths* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968), 1-52. Albright then influenced the work of Cross, and Freedman in their joint doctoral dissertation published in 1950. Its most recent incarnation is: Frank M. Cross and David N. Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1997). Robertson cemented the agreement about early dating of this poetry in 1972. Despite recent challenges, the early dating (pre-10th century) has been upheld by Lars E. Axelsson, *The Lord Rose Up From Seir: Studies in the History and Traditions of the Negev and Southern Judah* (ConBOT 25; Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987) and by Brian D. Russell, *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21* (SBL 101; New York: Peter Lang, 2007).

¹²⁸ Indications of early date are evident in some of the following: 3rd person plural suffix **וּ** (Exod 15:5), infinitive absolute with a temporal value as in **נִאֲדָרָה** "glorious" (Exod 15:6), the use of the *yaqtul* and perfect forms for past narration throughout the poem as in Ugaritic, the use of an uncontracted 3rd msng suffix (Exod 15:2, **וַיֹּאמְרוּ מִמֶּנִּי**), retaining the final vav and yod in an open syllable (Exod 15:5, **וַיִּכְסֵּימוּ**), **וַיִּ** as relative (Exod 15:13), use of the enclitic *mem* (Exod 15:5,8), lack of relative **אֲשֶׁר** replaced by other options, and use of fewer particles. For some of the morphological features see, Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*, 57-134. Also see, Russell, *The Song of the Sea*, 59-66. Russell discusses further features of early dating like Ugaritic staircase parallelism and Ugaritic phrases and word pairs. See, Russell, *The Song of the Sea*, 66-73.

Robertson considered Exod 15:1-18 the most secure early poem.¹²⁹ The early dating of the Song of the Sea has received only minor challenges and continues as a pre-10th century text preserving the earliest Israelite expression of YHWH's kingly relationship to Israel.¹³⁰

The task here is to understand the type of divinity the Song of the Sea proposes, and to understand YHWH's kingship at an earlier stage. Examinations such as structural analysis, repetition, narrative progression, staircase parallelism and its relation to Ugaritic parallelism, and redaction criticism have been used to date the poem.¹³¹ While these

¹²⁹ The limited studies that challenge the early date of the text (12th-10th century) and date the Song to the post-exilic period, have not taken up Robertson in any detail: Marc L. Brenner, *The Song of the Sea: Exodus 15.1-21* (BZAW 195; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1991). Brenner argues Exod 15:1-18 is a second temple composition but does not convincingly explain its relation to Ugaritic mythology nor does Brenner provide a satisfactory explanation for the poem's archaic features. On the latter point, Brenner does not even engage with Robertson's linguistic analysis, nor does Brenner even include Robertson in his bibliography.

¹³⁰ More recently, Russell has also demonstrated an early date for the Song of the Sea. Russell has asked the important question regarding the results of multiple trajectories of academic disciplines for the dating question. Russell uses inner-biblical use of the Song (using a relative chronology from texts the Song influenced to triangulate a date for the Song) and the Psalms of Asaph's reliance on the Song as a dating method. Russell, *The Song of the Sea*.

¹³¹ Russell critiques Dozeman's redactional division. Dozeman proposes that the Song be divided into Exod 15:1-12; 18 making Exod 15:13-17 its own literary unit. His arguments explore shifts in content and genre, lack of verb agreement in the two sections and the use of Ugaritic parallels in the first layer but not the second. Thomas B. Dozeman, *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition* (New York University: Oxford University Press, 1996). Following J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen: Israel Begegnung mit dem kanaänischen Mythos in den Jahwe-König-Psalmen* (FRLANT 141; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 99, Dozeman notes a shift in content where Ex 15:1-12; 18 deals with YHWH alone, the battle, the enemy and YHWH's victory. Conversely, Exod 15:13-17 deals with Israel, Israel being led by YHWH, Israel at the cult and Israel's relation to the other nations.

Dozeman explains vv. 1-12, 18 division as a pre-exilic tradition that was later divided by a Deuteronomistic (D) insertion in Exod 15: 13-17. Perhaps, it is of little surprise that we might see a deuteronomistic insertion in a war poem, given D's concern with holy war (Judg 4-5; 6-8; Deut 25:17-19, etc.). Although Dozeman's identification of Exod 15:13-17 as D has some problems, Dozeman never indicates what specifically the D language of vv. 13-17 is, with the exception of arguing that the word "dry ground" represents a D interpretation of the sea tradition (Josh 2:10, 4:23, 5:1) that is absent in vv.1-12: Thomas B. Dozeman, *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition* (New York University: Oxford University Press, 1996), 155. Yet "dry ground" as a term to express the sea crossing is not limited to D language (Pss 66:6, 78, 106:9; Isa 19:5; Nah 1:4?). A closer look at the language in vv.13-17 seems to indicate that it is in fact different from vv.1-12, but not because it is D. Consider the list Weinfeld offers between the D and the P material. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 36. None of these terms in Weinfeld's D list appear in the Song of the Sea as a basis for vv. 13-17 as D. Yet Dozeman offers some D concepts such as divine leading (vv. 13, 17), fear of the nations (vv. 14-16a) and Israel's crossing (v.16b).

approaches have solidified an early date (12-10th B.C.E), the following analysis reorients those methods to identify the type of divinity expressed in the Song. These methods are used to bring the author's message of YHWH's divinity to the fore. We will see that all literary features of the poem present YHWH's kingship as an early warrior deity, devoid of creation language and concerned with a limited kingship.

Parallelism

There are various types of parallelism, many of which are evident in the Song of the Sea. For example, Exod 15:1b (after the prose introduction) demonstrates semantic parallelism, (also called seconding or focusing) where B builds upon A; the latter states YHWH's greatness and the former states why YHWH is great. There is also parallelism with augmented word pairs in Exod 15:4 (בִּים . . . בִּים סוּף),¹³² or more complex forms like two-line staircase parallelism in vv. 6-7a, where a couplet proceeds in steps, in this case as repetition or a refrain.¹³³

יְמִינְךָ יְהוָה נֹאדְרֵי בָכָה
יְמִינְךָ יְהוָה תִּרְעֵץ אוֹיֵב

“Your hand YHWH glorious in strength
Your hand YHWH shatters the enemies”

Other cases of staircase parallelism are in vv. 6-7a; 11; 16b. The task of identifying various moments of parallelism has been advantageous in drawing the Song closer to similar types of parallelism in Ugaritic. But such discussions are of little benefit for understanding the content of the poem. One must ask how such poetic analyses relate to the message communicated by the poet/redactor.

¹³² Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry* (JSOTSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 132.

¹³³ Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 150, 154.

Every line of the Song of the Sea, from 15:1b following, can be identified with some form of parallelism. Thus, the absence of parallelism when it is expected may be significant.¹³⁴ Consider that v. 18 has an absence of parallelism and cannot be linked with the narrative aspects of v. 19. Further, v. 17 contains internal repetition/parallelism with the vocative יהוה. Yet the יהוה of v.18 is not part of this vocative sequence due to the following qal imperfect.¹³⁵ As the climax of the Song, v.18 is set apart from the rest of the poem due to its (intentional) lack of parallelism.

Another type of “parallelism”¹³⁶ highlights the importance of v.18. In trying to argue for the unity between vv. 1-12 and vv. 13-18 (divided in redactional studies), Smith suggests that the two parts are linked via parallelism of sound, which he classifies as “sonant parallelism.” Beyond using such parallelism to link redacted layers, it is of interest that one of these sonant links is between v. 18 (יַמְלֹךְ) and v. 12. (יַמְיִן).¹³⁷ The connection is strong since the two words share the initial two radicals, and the *kaf sophet*, while they could also share similar tripartite syllabic division in their earlier forms.¹³⁸ This sonant link invites a parallel of content and not just grammatical parallelism. The words being linked are important for the type of kingship described in the poem. As warrior king, YHWH’s kingship is sung in v. 18. This is paralleled with YHWH’s

¹³⁴ This is different than gapping or ellipsis in which one element in a parallel—such as the verb—is absent where it is expected. See, Paul E. Dion, *Hebrew Poetics: A Students Guide* (Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1988), 12. Also see Michael P. O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 122; Lois A. Schökel, *A Manuel of Hebrew Poetics* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1988), 157; Nicholas P. Lunn, *Word–Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry: Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics* (Great Britain: Paternoster Press, 2006), 18; Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, 303-04.

¹³⁵ Rather, the common construction of the vocative is in apposition to the second-person pronoun. Bruce K. Waltke and Michael P. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 77.

¹³⁶ This is not part of parallelism in a traditional sense. Smith’s term is better classified as a sonant link or “strategic assonance,” but is discussed under parallelism since this is Smith’s designation.

¹³⁷ Mark S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus* (JSOTSup 239; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 205.

¹³⁸ In Hebrew **yamīnka* > *yēmīnēkā* (v.12) and in v.18 **yamluku* > *yimlōk* (a/u class).

kingship gained through battle and specifically the strength of YHWH's right hand in v. 12. The result of kingship parallels its cause: the might of YHWH's right hand in war. This parallel thus fully defines who this **אֵל מֶלֶחֶמָה** (v.3) is. The ultimate purpose and point of the Song is to demonstrate YHWH's kingship and to link it to the root of kingship in his role as a warrior deity.

Repetition

Repetition can occur over distances and is not limited to single bicola or tricola. The refrains/vocatives "O YHWH," in vv. 6, 11 and vv. 16-17 are of particular interest. While the repetition of a vocative in a poem that was likely used in a liturgical setting is not uncommon, the structure that repetition takes is note-worthy. It appears just before common points of the Song. For example, before the enemies' boast in v. 9, the vocative occurs in v. 6. Then the "O YHWH" in v. 11 precedes the last reference to the enemies of YHWH in v. 12.

This would not be significant if the same repetition did not occur before v. 18, the conclusion of the poem. The vocatives precede references to the enemies, which have a thematic link with YHWH's kingship since that kingship (v. 18) is the result of victory over the enemies (v. 12). Finally, in vv. 16-17, vocatives are given in increased intensity (three times) just before the conclusion and are the ultimate claim of YHWH's kingship. Like the strategic use of parallelism, the repetition of the vocative immediately precedes common points of the Song. Those link YHWH's kingship with his command over the enemies, thus expressing YHWH's kingship through the lens of the warrior tradition.

Sounds

The content of verse 18 continues as a climax to YHWH the warrior in the Song's use of sounds.¹³⁹ First, there is the repetition of sounds/words in v. 1 of שִׁיר followed by הַשִּׁירָה in v. 1a then אֲשִׁירָה in v. 1b. This instance combines the prose and poetry sections through an introduction to the genre. The use of “song/singing” repeated at this juncture introduces the genre that follows and is completed in the final song to YHWH in v.18.

Along with the repetition of שִׁיר and גִּאֲזָה in v. 1, v. 2b repeats the third masculine singular suffix הוּ. The divine name יְהוָה emphasizes who the song is for given its repetition in v. 3a and 6a. In contrast to this repetition, there is gap in repetition until v. 7a. Verse 7a has the repetitive sound of the *kaf sophet* in קָמִיד and חֲרִנֶךָ. Then in v. 9b there is a more complex form with the *hireq yods* (both long i's in proto-Semitic) of חֲרִבִּי and יָדִי interspersed between the two occurrences of מו in מוֹלֵאֲמוֹ and תּוֹרִישְׁמוֹ; the ת at the head can be classified as an alliteration. Then in v. 11a there is the repetition of מִי כַמְכָה followed by the similar sounding phrase in v. 12 and v.13: נִטִּית יָמִינֶךָ (v. 12) // נָחִית בַּחֲסֶדֶךָ (v. 13). Verse 13 also has, one after the other, גִּאֲלַת נָחֵלֶת, גִּאֲלַת נָחֵלֶת. This is in between another repetition of sounds in v. 13, with בַּחֲסֶדֶךָ (v. 13a) and קִדְשֶׁךָ (v. 13b). Then there is a gap in the repetition until v. 16 with the repeated phrase עַד יַעֲבֹר. The similar sounds pick up again with some intensity in v. 17 along with the vocative discussed previously. Here there is the repeated מו then the repeated *kaf sophet* of לִשְׁבַּחְךָ and נָחֵלֶתֶךָ picked up at the end of this verse in יָדִיךָ. In both these cases we could call this rhyme or dominant sounds.¹⁴⁰

The relevance of this repetition is evident in the overall structure. There is repetition of sounds in vv. 1-3. Then, there is a gap until v. 7, while there is another

¹³⁹ For a discussion of this category, see Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 20-33.

¹⁴⁰ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 25-26.

steady repetition of sounds in vv. 9-13, with another gap until vv. 16-17 just prior to v. 18. More complex uses of repetition correspond to more important subjects. In vv. 1-3 the emphasis is on the song and to whom it is directed. In vv. 12-13 the people are led by YHWH, through his act of war, for the purpose of coming to YHWH's holy dwelling. Indeed, the effect of YHWH's actions on the people is of great importance to the song in its final form. Then the repetition in v. 17 deals with the topic of YHWH's dwelling. Here it is relevant that the most prominent repetitive sound is the second masculine singular suffix. Such repetition draws in the reader's/listener's attention before the conclusion, and simultaneously highlights the type of deity treated in that conclusion. Given the repetition the reader/listener comes to expect, it is striking that all repetition (along with parallelism) ceases at v. 18. Verse 17 prepares the reader/listener for something, but instead of repetition, the listener receives a statement that stands alone in the whole Song. Verse 18 has no repetition of like sounds or phrases. It is the climax of the poem and thus stands out both in content and in style. Such arrangement of sounds within one poem for a specific purpose (sound configuration) is recognized elsewhere (Isa 6 and Ps 137).¹⁴¹

Narrative Progression and Structure

Considering structure in relation to the narrative progression in the Song also uncovers the type of kingship in Exod 15:18. This study follows Propp that content

¹⁴¹ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 31-33.

should be a source of structural division over poetical features.¹⁴² Likewise, Childs observes that this aspect of the Song's narrative requires more attention.¹⁴³

This poem offers multiple references to the defeat of the enemies, including their taunt in v. 9 after they have supposedly been defeated (v. 4). Clearly a sequence of events is not being described. Yet in this flash of images, there is still a logical narrative structure and progression built into sections of praise alongside sections of narrative detail. This is evident in the first section of the Song in v. 1b: "I will sing to YHWH for he is greatly exalted, horse and his rider he has thrown in the sea." Here, there are two conceptual statements, one of praise of the king and one of narrative detail of YHWH the warrior. This bicolon sets up the two types of content that will be discussed throughout the poem. The reader/listener then expects to learn more about these two throughout the poem. Thus the first bicolon acts as a thesis statement for the subjects to be treated.

This introduction reveals a mini-structure followed throughout the Song: that events occur as a direct result of YHWH's military actions. The first bicolon contains various images of the warrior YHWH exalted (גָּדָל גָּדָל) over his enemies contrasted with the enemies cast low (רָמָה). The praise is given a reason, it is because "horse and his rider he has thrown in the sea" that YHWH is גָּדָל גָּדָל (v. 1b). The listener expects the Song to praise YHWH throughout, while giving narrative details of what happened to the horse and rider and thus the reason for praise. The listener's expectations are reinforced by the language of casting and rising that develops throughout the Song. Thus the second section is a praise interjection (vv. 2-3a). It is suiting that the first bicolon is praise and

¹⁴² Propp divides the text based on content and then looks for intentional division markers. His system leads to three divisions of 15:1b-7, 15:8-12, then 15:13-18. William C. Propp, *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2; New York: Doubleday, 1999), 505.

¹⁴³ Childs states: "surprisingly enough, little emphasis has been placed on the narrative sequence within the Song;" Brevard Childs, *Exodus* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974), 244.

then the section that follows is also praise. The remainder of the poem continues the theme of exalting YHWH, while articulating in more detail YHWH as a “man of war.”

The third section (vv. 4-8) is another moment of narrative detail where the listener learns who the horse and riders are. But more than this, YHWH’s military action is the cause and source of the actions against Pharaoh’s army. Thus vv. 4-5 are a more detailed explanation of what happened while vv. 6-8 are the cause and the source expressed via parallelism. Here the reader first learns that the person cast into the sea is Pharaoh (v. 4) and that this is YHWH’s enemy (v. 6) who is treated by YHWH as straw consumed (v. 7). This section ends with an explicit description of YHWH as the cause of the waters rising up (v. 8).

The fourth section (vv. 8-10) begins with the taunt of the enemy of YHWH. This section could also be considered an extension of the third, but the interjection of the enemies’ voice seems to warrant its own section. Here, YHWH is not only the cause of the Pharaoh’s falling in the water, but now YHWH is directly responding to Pharaoh.

The fifth section (v. 11) is another praise interjection. The praise continues in the sixth and final section (vv. 12-18), particularly dealing with the results of YHWH’s actions against his enemies. That is, in this final section the effects of YHWH’s actions for Israel are made known.

Structural Analysis and its Relevance for Verse 18

These five sections emphasize that the root of praise is in the salvific acts of YHWH expressed in the warrior tradition. In that structure, the poet/redactor develops the images of YHWH rising, versus the images of the enemies falling; exaltation and lifting up (primarily in the praise of YHWH) is an image placed in the readers’ minds three

times; in contrast with the falling of the enemies (v. 4, v. 5, v. 10, v. 12) exaltation occurs in *גָּאֵה גָּאֵה* of v. 1 and in *נָוֶה* and *רִוּם* of v. 2. By v. 18 we are given the fulfillment and ultimate expression of that image of exaltation; now YHWH is exalted as warrior-king.

Like other literary features, the contrasting images of rising and falling highlight the importance of v. 18 as a climax of the Song. They are constant images throughout the whole poem that uncover the poem's explanation of divine kingship. The images and movement of rising and falling are embodied in the rising voice of praise, and then the exaltation of YHWH. In the first half Pharaoh's army falls and this is the dominant image compared to the exaltation of YHWH by the worshippers. The images of falling and rising, the only consistent movements in the Song, are epitomized in the image of YHWH's ultimate exaltation and rise in taking his place as king in v. 18. In this way, the military action of YHWH mitigates movement and praise in the poem.

Summary of Exodus 15

A re-analysis of the poetic features showed that Exod 15:1-18 is primarily concerned with YHWH's kingship and roots that kingship in the role of YHWH the warrior. This type of kingship is comfortable in an early Canaanite context and specifically in the mythical echoes of the Baal tradition.¹⁴⁴ Along with linguistic dating, correspondence with Baal's kingship further situates the poem at an early date. Thus Exod 15:1-18 is an early poem of a warrior king and exalts YHWH kingship in reference to the warrior tradition for the benefit of a select group of people.

¹⁴⁴ Dozeman, *God at War*, 156-159; Carola Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Amsterdam: Oorschot, 1986). Russell, *The Song of The Sea*, 39-41. For the Baal Cycle, see Mark Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume I: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2* (VTSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1994) and Mark Smith and Wayne Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume II: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4* (VTSup 114; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Exodus 15 and Psalm 93: Differences in YHWH's Kingship

Clearly there are differences between the kingship of Exod 15 and the kingship presented in the YHWH kingship Psalms. The discussion of these Psalms argued they were intentionally demythologized away from a particular view of YHWH in the divine council and from the warrior tradition. A brief comparison of Ps 93 and Exod 15 emphasizes the development being made by the YHWH kingship Psalms away from a specific early Israelite idea of YHWH's kingship.

Psalm 93 has a variety of parallels to Exod 15, but in each case the YHWH kingship Psalm develops the aspects of divinity presented in Exod 15. We can consider two representative examples. Ps 93:4 describes the power of YHWH over the waters and his ability to control them: *מקלות מים רבים אדירים משבריים אדיר במרום יהוה*, "More than the roars of the mighty noble waters, more than the waves, YHWH is noble on the heights." Exod 15:10 reads *נשפת ברוחך כסמו ים צללו כעופרת במים אדירים*, "You blew with your breath, the sea covered them, they sank like lead in the noble waters". Both texts utilize similar language of YHWH's kingship (Ps 93:1// Exod 15:18) to show that YHWH is greater than the "noble waters." Recalling the Baal tradition, both texts also imply the displacement of Baal in favor of YHWH as the one who is more powerful than the sea.

As Exod 15 develops from its Canaanite echoes, Ps 93 not only develops away from a Baal-like expression, but moves beyond its own earlier Israelite tradition of YHWH's kingship. For the psalmist, it is not enough to show that YHWH replaces Baal. The psalmist disassociates YHWH from the waves that the Song of the Sea linked to YHWH. This is evident first in 93:3, where the actions and roar of the waves act

independently of YHWH and, second, in 93:4 where YHWH is more powerful than the waves. In Ps 93:3 YHWH does not raise these waters up in the *hiphil*, but they act by themselves (as the *qal* of נָשָׂא indicates). In contrast, in Exod 15:4 YHWH throws the chariots in the sea and as a result the deep waters cover the enemies. While the description of the sea's covering is not directly related to YHWH (תַּחַם יַבַּיִם v. 5), Exod 15:4 and Exod 15:6 display YHWH's actions like throwing his enemies into the sea and the might of his strong hand. These references structurally envelop v. 5, implying YHWH's control of the seas. Finally, YHWH's control of the waves is explicit in v. 8, where his breath makes the waves pile up וּבְרוּחַ אֶפֶיךָ נֶעְרְמוּ מַיִם (Exod 15:8).¹⁴⁵

Unlike the Song of the Sea, the Psalm does not have YHWH controlling the waves. While for Exod 15:10 YHWH's control of the waves leads to the conquering of enemies, for the Psalm YHWH's kingship is beyond the minor and inconsequential movement of mighty waters. Rather, YHWH's kingship is more powerful than these waves and disassociated from them. Those waves are contextualized as a minor element that are not controlled by YHWH, but that react to YHWH's kingship, which is now rooted in creator language. In the Song of the Sea YHWH's relationship to the waters is an essential literary echo of the Baal tradition that the Song is attempting to supplant. By contrast Ps 93 removes any interaction between the waves and YHWH, which effectively removes the Baal allusions, and also removes limitations on YHWH kingship.¹⁴⁶ Like the

¹⁴⁵ While נֶעְרְמוּ is not in the *hiphil*, here the *bet* is used instrumentally with the *niphal* in tolerative use; thus the subject of the waters allows the wind to act upon it. See Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (rev. ed.; Subsidia biblica 27; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), §51c; Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §23.4f-g.

¹⁴⁶ This is similar to the association between YHWH and Baal in 1 Kgs 18. Here YHWH is associated with Baal in his command over the lightning. The risk with such an association is making YHWH no more than a Baal substitute. While this may have been acceptable at one stage in Israelite history, eventually YHWH's pantheistic qualities (such as control of the lightning) needed to be supplanted

other Psalms of YHWH's kingship, Ps 93 chooses a different point of emphasis; creation itself is the source of YHWH's kingship: אִף־תִּכּוֹן תִּבֵּל בִּלְתַּמוּט (Ps 93:1) not the warrior tradition.

The Absence of a Creation Motif in Exodus 15

Creation is the source and proof of YHWH's kingship in Pss 93, 95-99. The earlier corpus of YHWH kingship texts lacks such references. Yet McCarthy argues that creation is implied in the text. McCarthy's argument assumes the well-established Ugaritic echoes in the Song of the Sea, and thus presumes the struggle of Baal with the waters, fertilizing the earth through the seasonal rains, must mean YHWH's creative power is also implied in the Song of the Sea.¹⁴⁷ Recently, Russell also assumes, without discussion, that the creative power of YHWH is implied in the Song of the Sea.¹⁴⁸ Yet these assumptions, like those outlined in chapter 1, again conflate expectations about what YHWH's kingship should be in the HB by passing all kingship references through the lens of the YHWH kingship Psalms.

McCarthy identifies creation language in Exod 15:16 via the verb קָנָה.¹⁴⁹ There is some evidence this verb means "create" in Ugaritic; however, it lacks such a connotation in Exod 15. While McCarthy does not bring the Ugaritic texts to bear on his discussion, one could argue that Kirta has examples of this verb in the sense of creation. Kirta wants

as well. Thus, whether a later text or redaction, 1 Kgs 19:11-14 is very clear to disassociate YHWH from the implications of his divinity as presented in 1 Kgs 18.

¹⁴⁷ Dennis J. McCarthy, "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry," in *Creation in the Old Testament* (ed. B. W. Anderson; IRT 6; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 74-89. This paper is a revision of Dennis J. McCarthy, "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry" *CBQ* 29 (1967): 393-406.

¹⁴⁸ Russell, *The Song of the Sea*, 16.

¹⁴⁹ This verb seems to have caused some difficulty in the Versions. While the LXX understands it in the sense of "acquire" ἐκτάσω, the Targums and Peshitta, perhaps struggling how to understand קָנָה, give it as a sense of redemption with the addition of the Jordan: *Tg. Onq.* "While this people whom you redeemed (דְּפִרְקִיתָּא יְיָ יִרְדְּנָא דְּפִרְקִיתָּא דְּנִין עָמָא דְּנִין דְּיִיעִיבֵר עָמָא דְּנִין), passed over the Jordan" Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 114.

to have sons and says: “give me sons so I may procreate” [*tn.*] *bnm.aqny*/ (KTU 1.14. II.4). Here *aqny* means “I will create” and is used much the same way in other Ugaritic texts.¹⁵⁰ Yet the HB use is more likely “to acquire.” We already see this denotation at Ugarit in the use of *qny* [*qanaya*] “he acquired” in an economic text (KTU 3.9, 2). Except for a few verses in Genesis, the dominant usage of קנה in the HB is “to acquire.”¹⁵¹

Finally, given the literary context of YHWH bringing Israel to the holy mountain and planting them, the sense of acquiring Israel works better than creating them in Exod 15:1-18. Acquiring also works well with the supposed situation of divinity at this time (Deut 32:8-9) in which YHWH acquires his people from El.¹⁵² Besides this example McCarthy’s primary evidence for the creation motif in the Song of the Sea is its relationship to other myths that have aspects of creation, like the *Enūma eliš* or the Baal Cycle. Yet he finds differences as well. What YHWH does in Deut 32 and Exod 15 when

¹⁵⁰ *aqny* [*aqniyu*] KTU 1.14 II, 4; *yq[n]y* [*yaqniyu*] KTU 1.19 IV, 58. See Daniel Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (HdO 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001).

¹⁵¹ See Genesis 4:1; 14:19. The rest of the uses are regarding acquiring land and slaves, the latter of which fits the context of the Song of the Sea. For Exod 15:16 the JPSV uses “ransomed”.

¹⁵² The biblical tradition is replete with examples of YHWH “acquiring” his people. For example, consider Isa 11:11 and Ps 74:2. Elsewhere YHWH acquires the holy mountain for interacting with the divine presence, Ps 78:54. For an analysis of Deut 32:8-9 consider v. 8: “When Elyon gave the nation as an inheritance, When he separated the sons of man, he established boundaries [for] the peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel/the gods (v.9). For YHWH’s portion was his people, Jacob the portion of his inheritance”. The issue is whether sons of the gods is the more original reading. While the MT has בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל the LXX has ἄγγελων θεοῦ while Symmacus υἱῶν θεοῦ. The Peshitta agrees with the MT as does Tg ~Ps. J. בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. Yet helpfully 4Q Deut¹ has בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים. Despite some suggestions 4Q Deut¹ also reads “sons of the gods” it contains only the last word of line nine: Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, et al. *Qumran Cave 4, IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. DJD XIV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 139. The BHS apparatus notes the Symmacus reading as probably correct. This is likely given the tendency in some versions of the LXX to correct “sons of god” in the Hebrew text to angels; see Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Wis. 5:5. The main point is that El and YHWH are distinct deities in which El, the head of the council, allots various spheres of authority to the gods. YHWH is one of the gods and his portion is Israel/Jacob. Given the date of Deut 32 (10th BCE?) and the position of YHWH, we likely have a remnant of an older tradition in which YHWH is subordinate to El in the divine council.

certain “creation” verbs are used is not what we expect of gods from the typical creation myths.¹⁵³

McCarthy’s discussion did not have the benefit of an alternate model that views YHWH’s divinity diachronically. As we have seen in scholarship, the assumption is made that YHWH of early poetry is the head god who must correspond to the same type of divine kingship evident in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship. Yet this is not the case. McCarthy’s treatment also shows something important. The creator elements of YHWH’s kingship, which we expect of a YHWH kingship text, are absent. This is the point: the Song of the Sea does not fit form-critically, linguistically, or historically into the same expression of divinity as the YHWH-kingship Psalms. Rather, the Song of the Sea and other early HB texts make up a separate corpus and promote a different expression of YHWH’s kingship.

Summary: The Elements of YHWH’s Kingship in Exodus 15

The preceding section assessed poetic and structural elements in relation to the content of the poem. This revealed an overwhelming concern in the poem for the kingship of YHWH. It also established the type of king that YHWH was in the poem. YHWH’s kingship in Exod 15:1-18 is closely related to that of Baal. In this kingship is a concern for battle with the forces of chaos, where military victory earns kingship. Past scholarship has consistently demonstrated the similarity of YHWH’s kingship to Baal’s in the early poetry of the HB. In this context, YHWH is a warrior king battling another king to demonstrate his authority and rule. Any salvation that comes to the people as a result of YHWH’s kingship is because of YHWH the warrior.

¹⁵³ McCarthy, “Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry,” 79-80.

In either its early form or redacted form, the poem has a specific vision of YHWH's kingship. In the early layer of Exod 15:1-12, 18, the changes away from Ugaritic influence make YHWH's kingship uniquely Israelite. The shift to a battle with the human king rather than another god is an important way that the poet articulates YHWH's sphere of influence as a limited kingship concerned with Israel. Yet YHWH kingship remains limited like Baal's since both deities' sphere of authority is over the storm. Likewise, the redactional layer of Exod 15:13-17 makes the limited kingship of YHWH explicit. The Israelites are the primary beneficiaries of YHWH's battle and are given their place in the temple (v.13). Even the geographical concerns of the text are limited to Philistia (eastern Mediterranean coast), Edom (perhaps Wadi al-Hesa representing the northern border of Edom), Moab (south-east of the Dead-Sea) and Canaan. Here YHWH is against the other "nations" (i.e., the political groups around the Levant) on behalf of Israel. He is one god among many who has taken up the battle against Israel's enemies for a geographically specific location.

Such limited kingship is understandable given the early date of the poem and corresponds well with Handy's "spheres of authority". It is before a time of imperialistic and a universalistic tendency among the ruling nations in the ANE; a time before monotheism and before YHWH is expressed as a creator king.¹⁵⁴ YHWH's limited

¹⁵⁴ Here we accept Smith's construction of monotheism as a late emergence to Israel and the ANE as well; Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 180-188. Smith defines two stages: Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 175-176. Smith's reconstruction is open for further reflection and development, but the movement from a YHWH well placed in a Canaanite context, to a YHWH that is less anthropomorphic and more transcendent in later literature, is accepted here. Mettinger comes to a similar explanation in his discussions of Shem and Kabod theologies as developments from YHWH Sabaoth theology; Tryggve Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982).

Suggestions that Akhenaten or Marduk were the first expression of monotheism are unlikely. Marduk will be discussed in detail in chapter four. Akhenaten, an Egyptian king originally named Amunhotep IV, ruled Egypt from 1350-1333 B.C.E, during the New Kingdom period. As king he began

sphere of kingship is finally highlighted in the lack of reference to creator elements evident in later forms. In fact, the warrior-king in the Song, concerned with saving Israel, is not associated with many of the other features one expects of YHWH as king. This early kingship is not only in the Song of the Sea, but is apparent in other texts as well, as the following discussion will show.

Deuteronomy 33:5

The early corpus of YHWH's kingship includes Deut 33:5:

וַיְהִי בִישְׁרוֹן מֶלֶךְ בְּהַתְאַסֵּף רִאשֵׁי עַם יִחָד שְׁבִטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “And he will be king in Jeshurun, when the heads of the people gather, together with the tribes of Israel”.

Deuteronomy 33 is one of the oldest poems in the HB.¹⁵⁵ Early forms are present like, the suffix *מו* (33:2),¹⁵⁶ and the verb *אָתָּה* (33:2) considered earlier than *בוֹא*.¹⁵⁷ However, as noted earlier, since dating cannot be limited to linguistic features, other features must also be considered in order to determine a date.

One indication of the early date is YHWH's origins in the south. As discussed in chapter 1, the earliest expressions of YHWH's divinity are attested in southern regions.

building at Tell el Amarna and changed his royal titulary to “Light of the Aten” to disassociate himself from Amun. This emphasized the central role of the sun deity/disk (the Aten) in the worship of Akhenaten. This emphasis on one deity was done at the expense of others and such a centralized form never caught on in Egypt and was rejected by later rulers. Yet such elevation never denied the existence of other gods. Akhenaten still adores a triad of deities. For a slightly contrasting position see David P. Silverman, “Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt,” in *Religion in Ancient Egypt* (Ed. B.E. Shafer; Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991), 74-87. In the Great Hymn to Aten, Akhenaten worships the Aten (Re-Harakhty), the Akhenaten and Nefertiti (the Great Royal Wife). N. de Garis Davies, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna: Part IV Tombs of Parennefer, Tutu, and Ay* (Kegan Paul, Trnech, Trübner & Co.: London, 1908) 18, 19, 29-31 Plate XXVII. We should also note that his project of religious and social reform failed. This hymn to Aten parallels Ps 104.

¹⁵⁵ Cross and Freedman in their joint doctoral dissertation published in 1950. The most recent edition is: Cross and Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, 64. Note that Robertson's conclusion regarding the date of Deut 33 is not as concrete for the early date of Exod 15. Robertson notes standard and early forms in Deut 33. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*, 49, 67, 98, 127, 138, 148.

¹⁵⁶ For other examples see Exod 15:5 and Exod 15:7.

¹⁵⁷ The suffix and verb are early because they are prior to the clear distinction between Aramaic and Canaanite; Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 60.

In Deut 33:2 YHWH comes from the southern regions in the form of a sun deity, coming with his armies (מַרְבֵּבֶת קִרְשׁ v. 1).¹⁵⁸ YHWH is again rooted in a particular warrior vision well known in the HB and the Levant. If we are to interpret the following אֲשֶׁר־תֵּשֶׁבֶת as a form of lightning and thus the weapon of YHWH, as seen in Baal theophanies, the appropriate translation would be: “and he comes with ten thousand holy ones, from his right hand lightning (comes) for us” (33:2). One can easily see here a vision of YHWH, surrounded by his holy ones, in the typical smiting pose prevalent of warrior deities and warrior kings across the ANE.¹⁵⁹ Two options are available to render אֲשֶׁר־תֵּשֶׁבֶת as the weapon of YHWH. The preferable option given the context is seeing the words separately, with אֵשׁ as “fire” and תֵּשֶׁבֶת as a defective feminine perfect of תָּשַׁב “to fly.”¹⁶⁰

Additional allusions to the warrior tradition are present. Typically, Deut 33:2 is viewed as a march of YHWH as the sun.¹⁶¹ In such a text, one would also expect the armies of YHWH to accompany him as in other early poems as in Hab 3:5 or Judg 5:20; thus Deut 33:2 may refer to the hosts of YHWH. The warrior vision of YHWH in this battle imagery and elsewhere in the poem (33:1-3, 11) is expectedly accompanied with a description of YHWH’s kingship in 33:5.

While the warrior aspect of YHWH’s kingship is clear, in order to understand how that kingship is perceived, one must understand the meaning of וַיְהִי בִישְׁרוֹן מֶלֶךְ in 33:5. Is the subject YHWH, who becomes king, or is another king implied? Some have

¹⁵⁸ Axelsson, *The Lord Rose Up From Seir*, 48-50.

¹⁵⁹ Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 101.

¹⁶⁰ Rudolf C. Steiner, “*Dāt and ‘ēn: Two Verbs Masquerading as Nouns in Moses’ Blessing (Deuteronomy 33:2, 28)*,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 693-98. The LXX skips this problem ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ, “at his right hand his angels are with him.” The Qere indicates reading אֵשׁ “fire” and תֵּשֶׁבֶת as “law”. This interpretation is more in line with the context provided by the book of Deuteronomy, but does not account for the more immediate context of the warrior king coming from the south.

¹⁶¹ J. Glen Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 111; Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993), 244.

suggested Moses, since he is the subject of v. 4.¹⁶² Yet v. 4 is properly viewed as a later addition. First consider having תורה as the first word in Deut 33:4: “He gave to us the Torah of Moses . . .” In a theologically rich context such as Moses’ farewell speech, the use of תורה should arouse some interest. Various considerations suggest this verse is likely an addition, orientating the poem towards its present context in the book of Deuteronomy, allowing an earlier poem more narrative compatibility with its new context.¹⁶³ Mayes suspects this since the theme of Moses as lawgiver, while important for Deuteronomy, is not an aspect of Deut 33, making v. 4 foreign to the poem.¹⁶⁴ In addition to Mayes, we add that most of v. 4’s referents do not fit into the context of the poem. First, the reference to Moses in v. 4 only appears elsewhere in v. 1, that is, in the narrative introduction to this more ancient poem. No other reference is made to Moses in the entire poem. Second, the word צוה (v. 4) likewise does not appear in the rest of the poem. This is significant since the pronouncements to the tribes in the poem are not really commands, so to frame them as such suggests an addition. The word for assembly in v. 4 (קהל) is also absent from the rest of the poem. Rather, verbs, not nominal forms, are favored to describe the people gathered; examples are ברהאסף (v. 5) and ויתא ראשי עם (v. 21).¹⁶⁵ Finally, while the reference to Jacob in v. 4 does occur again in vv. 10, 28, it functions as an approval of one of the tribes that would not be the case with the absence of v. 4.

¹⁶² For one such example arguing Moses as king in this passage, see J.R. Porter, *Moses and Monarchy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 14.

¹⁶³ Nelson believes this is an additional intrusion into the original text and is the resolution to אשדה in 33:2; Richard D. Nelson, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 389, note c.

¹⁶⁴ Andrew D. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1979), 400.

¹⁶⁵ Note that the more archaic form is used here where we would regularly expect בוא.

The transition from v. 3 to v. 5 is more natural. The transition of v. 3 to v. 5 is a more typical expression of kingship like in the Song of the Sea. In v. 3 YHWH comes with his myriad of the army and in v. 5 YHWH's kingship is proclaimed. This order also fits better with other expressions of divine kingship. Like Baal's kingship or YHWH's kingship in Exod 15:1-18 already discussed, after any description of a Syro-Palestinian warrior deity in 33:2¹⁶⁶ a statement of kingship is expected. YHWH is thus the subject of the kingship being described in v. 5 since v. 4 is an addition.

While YHWH is considered king in this text, what type of YHWH king is being described? Nelson draws attention to the seemingly problematic location/people of Jeshurun, which localizes the kingship. He says: "emerging as king 'in Jeshurun' seems like an odd thing to say of a universal, divine kingship."¹⁶⁷ This demonstrates part of the point made in this chapter and in the introduction. Scholarly expectations of what YHWH's kingship should be are often at odds with how early texts describe that kingship. The association of YHWH's kingship with a specific localized interest in Israel, communicated as tribes, indicates that universal kingship is not the vision of this poem. Even the description of YHWH riding on the clouds (33:26), need not be universalistic,

¹⁶⁶ Such warrior elements are evident in Deut 33: 26, 27, 29.

¹⁶⁷ Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 389. The LXX also had difficulty with this verse: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ ἄρχων, "And he shall be, by means of his beloved one (ἡγαπημένῳ), a ruler." There are some textual problems in this reading of the LXX. Some manuscripts omit ἄρχων or have it with multiple spellings. Yet the manuscript tradition is consistent in its reading of ἡγαπημένῳ, "beloved", for בִּישְׁרוֹן. While this could indicate a different Vorlage, it is more likely the Vorlage has בִּישְׁרוֹן and the LXX is wrestling with how to translate it. While Deut 33:5 is not extant in 4Q45, the use of בִּישְׁרוֹן in texts where the LXX also struggles with it is extant in Deut 32:15; 4Q141 has: וַיִּבְעַט וַיִּשְׁמַן יִשְׁרוֹן. Secondly, the trend in the LXX of Deuteronomy is to change בִּישְׁרוֹן. In Deut 32:15 it is rendered λαωβ and in Deut 33:26, no equivalent is offered and בִּישְׁרוֹן is omitted. A final example outside the LXX Deuteronomy is Isa 44:2 where בִּישְׁרוֹן (in the MT and in 1QIsa^a) is rendered ἡγαπημένος "beloved". This is the same translation as in Deut 33:5. Therefore, it is more likely the LXX has difficulty with the Vorlage and the LXX versions are trying to account for that difficulty. For a list of the textual variants of Deut 33:5, see John W. Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum III; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 363.

but fits neatly into a Canaanite understanding of Baal's kingship and thus a limited sphere of authority in charge of natural forces.¹⁶⁸

The poem is not describing universal kingship; rather, it is expressing a localized and limited divine kingship much more in line with expressions of kingship before the centralization of worship in Jerusalem. Jeshurun as a title for Israel (Deut 32:15; 33:5, 26; Isa 44:2) reveals the poet's perception of YHWH's sphere of influence. YHWH became king over Israel, for the benefit of Israel. All relevant senses of the ב in בִּישְׁרוֹן (locative and specification) are applicable in this context. Finally, the poem concludes with the theme of divine warrior for the sake of Israel. In 33:26 יִשְׁרוֹן is again used in typical divine-warrior language as the one who rides the clouds (// Isa 19:11 Ps 18:11; 68:5, 34; 104:3). The purpose of the warrior-king is clear, רֶכֶב שָׁמַיִם בַּעֲזָרְךָ “the rider of the skies for your help” (Deut 33:26). Both the warrior language and the sphere of its concern reflect a limited warrior kingship appropriate for the date of the poem.

Summary

As with the kingship of YHWH in Exod 15, in which specific geographic locales denote the scope of divine influence, Deut 33 expresses a similar limited kinship via the situation YHWH enters, a gathering of the Israelite tribes. The localized nature of YHWH's kingship towards Israel is also evident in the movement of YHWH from the south. The movement of YHWH from Paran and Seir, towards the promised land, is clearly for the benefit of (לְמַעַן) the listeners, and is repeated twice in 33:2. Finally, the whole focus of the poem describes the benefit for and response of the tribes to the actions of YHWH as warrior-king. The pronouncements to each of the tribes are reflected in how

¹⁶⁸ Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses*, 91-95.

the saving act of YHWH's battle affects each of the tribes, specifically in terms of land and resources.

To crystallize the type of kingship being expressed, here we can contrast the much later text of Isa 66:1-2, which reflects the influence of the later YHWH as king theology of the Psalms of YHWH's kingship.

1 כה אָמַר יְהוָה הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּסֵּאִי וְהָאָרֶץ תַּבְנוּלִי
וְאֵיזָה מְקוֹם מְנוּחָתִי 2 וְאֵת־כֹּל־אֱלֹהֵי יָדַי עָשָׂתָה וַיְהִיו כֹּל־אֱלֹהֵי נַאֲסִיָּהוּ
וְאֵל־זֶה אֲבִיט אֶל־עַנִי וְנִכְהָרוּחַ וְחָרָד עַל־דְּבָרִי:

1. Thus says the Lord: “The Heavens are my throne and the earth the footstool of my feet, What is this house that you [could] build for me and what is this place of my rest?¹⁶⁹ 2. Since all these things my hand has made, since they came to exist” says YHWH “so I will look to this one, the afflicted and dejected of spirit, the one who trembles at my word.”

This post-exilic text has the benefit of a more fully developed theology of YHWH of the Jerusalemite cult and the reality that exile motivated more transcendent forms of divinity. YHWH is described in the most universal sense of kingship where no temple can hold him. In addition, the universalism is reinforced since it is not limited to Israel. We know this from other parts of Trito-Isaiah (Isa 56:1-5), where those who have been traditionally shut off from the Israelite community (Deut 23:2) are now welcomed to worship YHWH. In Trito-Isaiah, YHWH's kingship is not limited to a temple nor is it limited to a particular people. The latter is explicit in Isa 66:19, since glory is spoken not just among the tribes of Israel but also among all the nations. Like the Psalms, the warrior elements of YHWH are no longer a point of emphasis. Rather, YHWH is a creator-king as expressed in Isa 66:2.

Numbers 23:21

¹⁶⁹ The sense of this rhetorical question is: “what kind of house could you possibly build for me?”

A third poem also forms part of the corpus of early YHWH kingship texts. In Num 23:21, as in the Deut 33:5, there is some question whether the kingship refers to YHWH or not. The text reads:

לא־הָבִיט אֹן בִּיעֶקֶב
וּלְא־רָאָה עִמָּל בִּישְׂרָאֵל
יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו עִמּוֹ
וְהִרְוֶת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ

Iniquity is not observed in Jacob
and trouble is not seen in Israel
YHWH his God is with him
And the shout of [the] king is in/by/with him.¹⁷⁰

Numbers 23 is part of the Balaam cycle that describes how Balak, king of Moab, deals with his Israelite enemies by joining Midian and calling on a famous קסם (diviner)¹⁷¹ to curse the Israelites. This does not work out as Balak hopes and YHWH uses the foreign prophet for his own purposes. Our passage occurs in the second poetic section of this cycle, in which the קסם, Balaam, gives his second proclamation of YHWH's words to Balak.¹⁷²

Like the other YHWH kingship texts outside the Psalms, Num 23:18-24 has traditionally been dated early.¹⁷³ To assist in dating, we have substantial extra-biblical context for the Balaam tradition: the *Deir 'Allā* plaster wall inscriptions dated to 840-760

¹⁷⁰ The MT is likely secure; only a small section of this verse is evident in 4Q27:]אֶרְרָא[. The LXX struggles with the nouns מֶלֶךְ הַרְוֶת, preferring to see the first as an adjective describing the king. Thus, τὰ ἑνδοξὰ ἀρχόντων ἐν αὐτῷ “the glorious ruler is in him.”

¹⁷¹ Deut 18:10, 14; Josh 13:22; 1 Sam 6:2; Isa 3:2; 44:25; Jer 27:9; Ezek 13:9; 22:28; Mic 3:7; Zech 10:2. In this way, what is implied is a professional who is skilled in the art of divination. Thus it is inductive or *artificiosa* divination. The diviner usually accepted a fee for his/her work (Num 22:7). In the *Deir 'Allā* texts Balaam is a *hzh* (seer) as in Ezk 12:27, 13:16; Dan 2:31, etc.

¹⁷² In the context of the Balaam texts, the name El is parallel with YHWH. El and YHWH are not separate deities. As Num 23:21 says יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו עִמּוֹ “YHWH his God is with him”, Num 23:22 explains one way that אֱל “God” was with them. In this context the same deity is being referred to, versus in Deut 32:8-9 where El and YHWH are performing different actions.

¹⁷³ Albright proposes the earliest date, from the 12th-10th century, William F. Albright, “Oracles of Balaam,” *JBL* 63 (1944): 207-33.

B.C.E. and discovered in 1967.¹⁷⁴ These inscriptions were found on the floor of what was likely a non-Israelite sanctuary.¹⁷⁵ The dating for these texts has shifted somewhat, but now is set from either the second half of the ninth century or the eighth century.¹⁷⁶ The plaster inscriptions do not prove the existence of these biblical characters nor do they indicate when the biblical material was written. Yet they do provide some indication that the biblical material could easily have been composed around the same time. The *Deir 'Allā* texts demonstrate Balaam was a known literary or historical figure during the eighth century, that the special role of divination is acknowledged during this time, that the divine name El, also used in Numbers, corresponds to the divine name ʾil at *Deir 'Allā*, and finally, that various other literary connections about the revelation at night link the biblical and non-biblical accounts.¹⁷⁷ The linguistic evidence and inscriptional evidence solidify the early date. Again, here the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts has a particular vision of that kingship. In Num 23:21 what concerns us is identifying the kingship in the last half of the verse: וַתִּרְוַעַת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ. Is the king human or Divine?¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ For a text edition, see Jo-Ann Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā* (HSM 31; Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1984); Jacob Hoftijzer and Gerrit van der Kooij, eds. *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Allā* (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 19; Leiden: Brill, 1976); André Lemaire, "Les textes araméens de Deir 'Allā," *Syria* 54 (1977): 189-208; P. Kyle McCarter, "The Balaam Texts from *Deir 'Allā*: The First Combination," *BASOR* 239 (1980): 49-60.

¹⁷⁵ Room EE335 on the west wall. For a reconstruction of that room, see Gerrit van der Kooij, "Book and Script at Deir 'Allā," in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989* (eds. J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij; Leiden: Brill, 1990), 241; M. M. Ibrahim and Gerrit van der Kooij, "The Archaeology of Deir 'Allā Phase IX," *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated*, 16-29.

¹⁷⁶ Manfred Weippert, "The Balaam Texts from Deir 'Allā and the Study of the Old Testament," in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated*, 176; Baruch Levine, "The Plaster Inscriptions from Deir 'Allā: General Interpretation," in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated*, 58-72.

¹⁷⁷ Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1993), 439-40.

¹⁷⁸ Noth favors the divine king here: Martin Noth, *Numbers* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), 187.

An answer is available by studying the contrasting kingships. The more immediate literary context sets up the kingship of Balak as a challenge to YHWH's kingship. Balak seeks the service of Balaam (22:4b) but YHWH uses Balaam for YHWH's service. The narrative thus constructs the question of which king has access to, and ultimately control over, the prophet. Throughout the ANE (e.g., Mari) and in the HB (2 Kgs 3; 1 Sam 28:3-25), it was common for the king to seek a prophecy or divination from a practitioner or someone skilled in various crafts. Here the question of legitimate kingship is clear. This competition between the two kings is ironic since Balak, in seeking Balaam to curse Israel, echoes the blessing and curse formulas which are YHWH's alone in Gen 12:3 and to a lesser extent Deut 30:19. Both Genesis and Numbers use very similar language.

(Num 22:6b) כִּי יָדַעְתִּי אֶת אֲשֶׁר־תְּבָרֵךְ מְבֹרָךְ וְאֲשֶׁר תְּאָרֵךְ יֵאָרֵךְ

“for I know whoever you bless will be blessed and whoever you curse is cursed”

(Gen 12:3) וְאֶבְרַכָּה מְבָרְכֶיךָ וּמְקַלְלֶיךָ אֶאָרֵךְ

“so I will bless whoever blessed you and whoever curses [you] I will curse”

The reader knows this formula belongs to YHWH, not Balak or the prophet. Thus Balak's pronouncement foreshadows that the power to bless or curse is only YHWH's. In such a context, the reference to the king in Num 23:21 is YHWH. YHWH as king here fits best with the general sense of Israelite consciousness that YHWH is the true king (Exod 15:18; Judg 8:23; 1 Sam 8:7, 12:12; Isa 33:22).

A final, more speculative, connection indicating that kingship of the deity is in view comes through a comparison with the *Deir 'Allā* texts. Those texts describe Balaam

meeting with the divine council (*šaddayin* I. 5-6 // the שדי of Num 24:4,16).¹⁷⁹ They indicate the head of that council as El (I.2; II 6.). Perhaps then the *Deir 'Allā* texts have the kingship of the deity as part of their tradition.

Beyond the divine council and the place of El, the archeological context is notable. On the wall plasters of the *Deir 'Allā* texts there occurred a winged sphinx or winged cherubim. It is not part of combination I (found closest to the wall and constructed as the bottom half) or combination II (found further from the wall and believed to be the top half) but part of 13 smaller fragments designated number XIV.¹⁸⁰ Since the plaster inscriptions were found on the floor, the original placement of the winged figure on the wall is debated.¹⁸¹ There is no discussion about the role this winged cherubim has in relation to the inscription. Given the literary context of a divine council and the head god El, a winged figure may echo aspects of divine kingship. The association between winged figures and thrones is known widely in the ANE and in Syria-Palestine.¹⁸²

YHWH as king here has a variety of features expected of early Israelite expressions of this kingship. Num 23:21 describe that kingship as ותרועת מלך בו “and the shout of the king is with/by him”. The warrior aspect of YHWH again has precedence in this text. First, the reference to the “shout/blast” (תרועת) is used elsewhere as a

¹⁷⁹ Combination I, lines 5-6. For the text, see Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā*, 25-26.

¹⁸⁰ For a drawing of this fragment, see Gerrit van der Kooij, “Book and Script at *Deir 'Allā*,” in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated*, 243, fig. 2.

¹⁸¹ van der Kooij and Hamilton debate the two locations in Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā*, 4, especially n. 19.

¹⁸² Consider the winged cherubim throne in 12th century ivories from Megiddo, or the similar image of King Hiram of Byblos (10th century). For more images of this nature, see Othmar Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997). Also see the informative discussion of origins of such imagery in Mettinger’s analysis of *Kabod* theology in Tryggve Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOTS 18; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982).

trumpet blast for a call to war (Josh 6:5; 2 Chr 13:2). In Numbers it is used as a march to war (Num 10:5-6) clarified in Num 10:9. While there are other possibilities for what תרועת refers to (like a human shout of joy or ritual call), in the context of YHWH's salvation and other references to war it is meant as a war cry, here of the divine king.

Just after the reference to YHWH as king, the warrior tradition is also evident in describing YHWH as כְּתוֹעַפַת רֶאֱשִׁים “like horns of a wild ox” (23:22; repeated in 24:8). While it is clear that God brings them out of Egypt in 23:22a, the second part of the verse is ambiguous; who is being described in the phrase כְּתוֹעַפַת רֶאֱשִׁים לוֹ, Israel or YHWH? If the latter, it possibly gives more insight into the warrior features of YHWH.¹⁸³

While commentators are divided, it is reasonable to consider YHWH is being described. The verse reads: אֵל מוֹצִיאֵם מִמִּצְרַיִם כְּתוֹעַפַת רֶאֱשִׁים לוֹ (Num 23:22), “El brought them out from Egypt, the horns of a wild ox for him/them”.¹⁸⁴ Other features indicate whose the horns are without Ashley's understanding of the *lamed*. First, the animal imagery for Israel in 23:24 is a lion, not a bull. One would suspect that if Israel were the bull, that there be some consistency in imagery throughout. Second, since the subject of v. 21 and v. 22a is YHWH, it is reasonable that the bull's horns are his. The YHWH who freed them from Egypt, is like a wild bull, fighting for the benefit of Israel. There are numerous examples in poetry where singular and plural forms refer to the same group in a poetic line. In the context, interpreting the *lamed* as advantage rather than possession offers a better translation, allowing the singular suffix to stand for the plural group Israel.

¹⁸³ The LXX is uncertain what to do with this phrase and chooses δόξα μονοκέρωτος, referring to a single horned animal.

¹⁸⁴ Most support the horns as referring to YHWH, not Israel. For a review of those sources, and his own agreement, see Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, 480-81.

Thus, we could translate 23:21: “God brings them out of Egypt/[he is] like the horns of a wild ox for them.”

That the kingship and the bull imagery is linked to the Exodus event, known for YHWH’s battle with the enemies of Israel, solidifies the militaristic imagery implied in YHWH’s kingship. The use of **הוֹעֲפֵת רֶאֱמ** in Num 24:8 expands on that phrase by stating that YHWH devours other nations and strips their bones. Also, various HB references to the wild ox (**רֶאֱמ**) also have warrior elements. Deut 33:17, notably part of the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts, describes the horns goring other nations. This same imagery is thus used to describe the strength of Israel; it is described as a lion that feasts on its prey (Num 23:24). The military might of YHWH gives Israel strength for a similar task.

Summary

Like YHWH as warrior in early kingship texts, in the Balaam cycle YHWH’s kingship is localized to Israel. The Exodus tradition in Num 22:11 and the reference to YHWH’s kingship in 23:22 both emphasize the separation of Israel from the other nations. Further, Balaam’s first oracle highlights the separation of Israel **הָיָעַם לְבִדָּד יֹשְׁבֵן** “behold, a people who dwell apart” (23:9). Verses 9 to 10 continue with the place of Israel as separate from the nations. The reference to Israel apart from the nations is not particularly unique, yet it is notable, and similar to our other texts, combined with actions of a warrior king. The horns of YHWH, his kingship and its effects on Israel as warriors, are all directed towards the benefit of Israel. Remembering Isa 66 as a representative text of later YHWH kingship, we again see that this corpus of early YHWH kingship texts

expresses a localized warrior king, with a limited kingship directed to one nation, who is not associated with other characteristics like creator.

Psalm 29: Establishing Differences From Earlier and Later Expressions of YHWH's Kingship

An analysis of Ps 29, now in light of the emerging corpus of early YHWH kingship texts, demonstrates that this Psalm's kingship is best situated within the early and not later layer of expression. Psalm 29 describes YHWH's kingship with echoes of Ugaritic and Canaanite mythology. The specific parallels of Ps 29 to the Baal Cycle need not be assessed here since the connections between Ps 29 and Ugaritic mythology are well established.¹⁸⁵ The Hebrew scribe of Ps 29 knew of the Baal traditions, and through them, composes a poem to supplant Baal in favor of YHWH.¹⁸⁶ Like comparing Exod 15 with Ps 93, comparing Ps 29 with Ps 96 further distinguishes the types of YHWH's

¹⁸⁵ For a text, see Mark Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume I: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2* (VTSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1994) and Mark Smith and Wayne Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume I: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4* (VTSup 114; Leiden: Brill, 2009). Works that discuss the general parallels between Ugaritic Baal types and the HB are: Carola Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (Amsterdam: Oorschot, 1986); Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses*, 70-90. Regarding Ps 29 in particular, in the Baal Cycle, Baal uses lightning in *KTU* 1.2 IV 20-25 and this parallels Ps 29:7, 9 where YHWH's theophany has a similar effect on the forest. For an accessible introduction that summarizes well the agreement in scholarship, see Dennis Pardee and Nancy Pardee, "Gods of Glory Ought to Thunder: The Canaanite Matrix of Psalm 29," in *Psalm 29 through Time and Tradition* (PTMS; ed. Lowell K. Handy; Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2009), 115-124. For a more technical explanation of poetic structure in the early dating of Ps 29, see Dennis Pardee, "On Psalm 29: Structure and Meaning," in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (ed. Peter Flint and Patrick D. Miller; VTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 153-81.

¹⁸⁶ Early theories supposed Ps 29 was an originally Phoenician hymn to Baal, later merely inserted with the name of YHWH. For an early argument against supposed Phoenician origin, see Craigie, "Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition," 143-151. More recent scholarship supports Craigie's critique. Pardee "On Psalm 29: Structure and Meaning," 158. Craigie provides a unique examination of Ps 29 as having Canaanite elements, but not as a borrowed hymn to Baal as sometimes supposed. Rather, Ps 29 for Craigie is a midway text between early poetry of Exod 15 and the later enthronement Psalms. Our analysis merely tries to situate Ps 29 before the enthronement Psalms as well and more like the early poetry than the expressions of YHWH's kingship in the "enthronement Psalms". Therefore, Craigie's argument for Ps 29 as a midpoint, if correct, is compatible with the argument being made here.

kingship and crystallizes the intentional development of the YHWH kingship Psalms from earlier Israelite tradition.

In Ps 29 YHWH is clearly the warrior deity whose kingship is limited since the Psalm is devoid of references to the universal–creator king. Furthermore, there are geographical limitations to YHWH’s kingship in Ps 29. Freedman has discussed the direction of travel of YHWH’s voice in the Psalm.¹⁸⁷ In the three strophes of the Psalm’s main section (vv. 3-9), each begins with thunderous voice of YHWH. Then the presence of YHWH follows a geographical sequence. In the first strophe (vv. 3-4) YHWH’s voice is over the Mediterranean, in the second (vv. 5-6) it is over Lebanon and Syria, and in the third (vv. 7-9) over the plains and forests. For Freedman this analysis identifies strophic patterns, but for this discussion it helps identify the limited sphere of YHWH’s kingship. The three strophes describing the areas around the Levant communicate a localized and limited vision of YHWH’s kingship, different from the universal kingship of the YHWH kingship Psalms.

There are other indications that Ps 29 describes a kingship of YHWH belonging to the early corpus of YHWH’s kingship and not the kingship expressed in Pss 93, 96-99. The differences between Ps 29 and Ps 96 show clear stages of development and thus are different expressions of YHWH’s kingship. While scholars like Zenger keep Ps 29 as part of the YHWH kingship Psalms,¹⁸⁸ Pardee’s analysis is the most promising. Based on his detailed structural analysis, Pardee reaches some provisional conclusions and offers brief

¹⁸⁷ David N. Freedman and C. F. Hyland, “Psalm 29: A Structural Analysis,” *HTR* 66 (1973): 241.

¹⁸⁸ Erich Zenger, “Theophanien des Königsgottes JHWH: Transformationen von Psalm 29 im Psalter,” in *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im Alten Orient* (ed., E. Zenger.; HBS 18; Fribourg: Herder, 2003), 183-85.

suggestions of why Ps 29, as Craigie also suspected, must be considered early.¹⁸⁹ We consider Pardee's suggestions and expand upon them.

First, Pardee suggests that the phrase "sons of god" in Ps 29 has been demythologized by the time of Ps 96. Exploring this option further, in Ps 29 the first imperative (הַבִּי) commands the בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים to acknowledge the glory and strength of YHWH. In contrast, Ps 96:1 shifts who is being addressed. Now those who sing YHWH's praises are "all the earth." In Ps 96 the power to proclaim YHWH's kingship belongs to the earthly congregation, not the divine council. In 96:3 those commanded to sing YHWH's praises are the earthly congregation. This audience is again made clear in 96:7: the "families of the earth" are charged with this task. Finally in 96:13 the focus of YHWH's kingship is the governance of the earth. It is not only the audience that demonstrates the universalistic vision of Ps 96. Since the created elements praise YHWH, the root of YHWH's kingship is in creation rather than in the warrior tradition.

Not only is Ps 96 developing from the type of kingship Ps 29 employs, but also it does this by creating a system in which the older forms cannot exist. Consider that the denial of the other gods in 96:5 is noted by what seems to be an out of place double causal כִּי. Psalm 96:4 and 5 give a reason for the proclamation of YHWH among the nations. In verse 4 the poet recognizes that YHWH is feared above the other gods

¹⁸⁹ Pardee, "On Psalm 29," 153-81; helpfully, the groundwork for contextualizing Ps 29 outside the YHWH kingship Psalms has already been done by noticing the stages of development in Hebrew poetry. Craigie has argued that Ps 29 should be dated somewhere between the Song of the Sea and the enthronement Psalms. Craigie demonstrates linguistic links between Exod 15 and Ps 29, showing that both are victory songs of the Israelites, but Ps 29's development from that tradition; Craigie, "Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition," 143-151. Dating Ps 29 to the early part of the united Monarchy and the enthronement Psalms to a later date, Craigie reflects a solidifying development of YHWH's kingship within the poetic tradition.

נִרְאָה הוּא עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים. Yet as we have seen in the transition of one stage of kingship to another, a brief echo of the older tradition is supplanted by the new. In direct response, and with another causal כִּי, in v. 5 the psalmist denies the existence of the gods כִּי כָל-אֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֱלִילִים. This could be an editorial injunction or it could be original to the text. In either case, the effect of both the double causal כִּי, combined with the echo of the older tradition being supplanted by the new, is striking in the final form and emphasizes the earthly creation doing the proclamation in replacement of the divine council. Another double כִּי clause in the final v. 13 emphasizes the presence of YHWH over all peoples; YHWH's justice now extends over other groups, in contrast to YHWH judgment only extending to the divine council. This gives further credence to Pardee's observation that in Ps 96:10-13, where YHWH is proclaimed as king and his coming is described, we would expect some echo of Baal language. Yet Pardee rightly notes "the Baal imagery disappears."¹⁹⁰

Like Ps 96, Ps 29 proclaims YHWH's kingship (Ps 29:10b) and is well rooted in a Canaanite version of kingship given the correspondence of YHWH sitting on the flood (מַבּוּל) with Baal enthroned over the flood in *KTU* 1.101.1-3.¹⁹¹ While Ps 29 is not as clear as Ps 96 in identifying who YHWH's kingship is primarily directed towards, those praising in 29:1 are the divine council. Other references to those bowing down in 29:9 must be interpreted in the same way. That said there is some evidence in Ps 29 that the earthly congregation is also imagined. The last verse asks for the power of YHWH to help his people, and in this way, whoever composes or sings this Psalm may imagine they

¹⁹⁰ Pardee "On Psalm 29," 179.

¹⁹¹ For a discussion of the connection between Ps 29 and the Baal imagery of the flood, see Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*, 97.

are also bowing down to the heavenly throne like the divine council does. Clearly the earthly worshippers are giving praise in Ps 29:10. The difference is that Ps 96 places emphasis on the earthly congregation to the extent that any vestiges of the divine council have been completely removed from the vision of YHWH's kingship, whereas in Ps 29, the earthly congregation may be duplicating the actions of the divine council as an ideal model.

Pardee also notes that Ps 96 expands and revises the material in Ps 29. While we cannot prove that there is a direct citation of Ps 29 by the composer of Ps 96, the language is similar enough to assume Ps 96 is expanding on the ideas, expression, and the language used in expressions of YHWH's kingship in Ps 29. For Pardee, Ps 96:7-9 expands Ps 29:1-2 by "transforming the staircase quadricolon into three bicola, with the third and fourth cola of the quadricolon each expanded into a bicolon by means of a new colon that is characterized primarily, as elsewhere in this poem, by grammatical parallelisms."¹⁹² As we have seen with Exod 15, these structural analyses can be married with an analysis of the literary content to which they relate. Expanding on Pardee's structural identifications, the texts are also linked with shared language. Looking at the texts in parallel shows the conceptual points of sameness and development. Differences are in bold and additions are double underlined:

¹⁹² Pardee "On Psalm 29: Structure and Meaning," 179.

Ps 29:1-2	Ps 96: 7-9
29:1 מזמור לדוד הבו ליהוה בני אלים הבו ליהוה כבוד ועז: 29:2 הבו ליהוה כבוד שמו השתחו ליהוה בהדרת־קדש: 29:1 A Psalm of David Ascribe to YHWH sons of the gods Ascribe to YHWH glory and might 29:2 Ascribe to YHWH [the] glory of his name Bow down to YHWH in holy beauty¹⁹³	96:7 הבו ליהוה משפחות עמים הבו ליהוה כבוד ועז: 96:8 הבו ליהוה כבוד שמו <u>שאו־מנחה ובאו לחצרותיו:</u> 96:9 השתחו ליהוה בהדרת־קדש <u>חילו מפניו כל־הארץ:</u> 96:7 Ascribe to YHWH, families of the peoples Ascribe to YHWH glory and might 96:8 Ascribe to YHWH [the] glory of his name <u>Carry the offering and come to his</u> <u>courtyards</u> 96:9 Bow down to YHWH in holy beauty <u>Writhe before his face all the earth</u>

Psalm 96 is the addition and expansion on the older tradition. First, the place of the הדרת־קדש in 29:2b is clarified in Ps 96. It is the earthly temple, since the people are encouraged to bring their offerings to it (96:8b). In Ps 96 the location is most probably Jerusalem, or originally another sanctuary of which this Psalm was then comfortably used in Jerusalem. Yet the location of the בהדרת־קדש in Ps 29, without the references to the offerings and the courts, could stand for any holy place where YHWH was worshiped. Second, there is an expansion of worship, at first limited to a group of deities, and then expanded to the whole world (96:7a, 9b). Rather, in conjunction with the “spheres of authority” explained by Handy above, Ps 29 concerns the sphere of a particular kingship which is limited since multiple deities can have various divine councils. Ps 96

¹⁹³ Here the heavenly temple is implied; the LXX (Ps 28:2) has “in his holy courtyard” αὐλῇ ἁγίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

emphasizes the reach of that kingship both in the language of universalism and by shifting the source of that kingship from a warrior to a creator tradition.

Psalm 96 reinforces YHWH's absolute kingship and deconstructs any suggestion of other powers. In a Psalm that denies the effectiveness of other gods (in the double כִּי clause), if it has Ps 29 as a literary Ur-text, it does not allow for anthropomorphic expressions. Nature does not cower before YHWH in Ps 96 as it does in Ps 29:5-9. Rather, in Ps 96, it is not the cedars of Lebanon that are affected (Ps 29:5-7) but, like the gods, the cedars are replaced by the people of God: חִילוּ מִפְּנֵי בַלְהָאֲרִיךְ (Ps 96:9). While there is a brief reference to the rejoicing of the seas and trees in Ps 96:11-12, compared to the emphasis of creation reacting to YHWH the warrior in Ps 29:5-9, Ps 96 gives a limited focus to the role of the natural world (Ps 96:11-12) and prefers a greater focus on the response of humanity to a kingship rooted in creation.

The differences in these Psalms exemplify different stages in the Israelite understanding of YHWH as king. This corresponds to the early dates of Ps 29 that have been long articulated.¹⁹⁴ If Pardee is correct in setting Ps 29 in a time of Hosea and Isaiah 2,¹⁹⁵ this also corresponds with Craigie's earlier date of Ps 29 and corresponds with the more explicit Baal language that is part of Ps 29 and Exod 15 compared to the more developed expressions of Ps 93, 95-99.

¹⁹⁴ Most dates suggested are pre-exilic and some early 12th century. David N. Freedman, "Who is Like Thee Among the Gods? The Religion of Early Israel," in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (ed. P.D. Miller, P.D. Hanson, S.D. McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 317.

¹⁹⁵ Dennis Pardee, "On Psalm 29: Structure and Meaning," 180. For the dating of Hosea and Isaiah to the period of Assyrian expansion see, Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 83-84; 101

Conclusions: Stages of YHWH's Kingship

The analysis in this chapter has compared the well-known Psalms of YHWH's kingship with other YHWH kingship texts of the HB. It is now evident that the Psalms express a universal kingship that is rooted in the theology of a creator deity. This expression is markedly different from the now emerging corpus of early YHWH kingship texts that express a limited kingship rooted in a warrior tradition. Such limited kingship is concerned with a specific people, a specific geography, and unlike Baal in Ugaritic literature, is not concerned with cosmic geography but physical land. The earlier corpus emphasizes the warrior deity clearly in Exod 15, and in the language of Ps 29 and Deut 33:5 as well as in the bull imagery of Num 23:21. In Exod 15 the warrior tradition is the primary method by which the poet claims YHWH's kingship. While YHWH's kingship in Exod 15 has been understood for some time, Exod 15 as well as Deut 33, Num 23:21 and Ps 29 are a cohesive expression of YHWH's early kingship; it is expressed differently from its Canaanite origins, but more at home in that context than in the developed kingship of later Jerusalemite Psalms. What emerges is first an early YHWH kingship corpus of texts that express YHWH like Baal, but develop away from that context in unique ways. Further, the preceding analysis identified several intentional developments from the warrior model to a universalism and creator language. This shift was best exemplified by comparing Exod 15 to Ps 93 and Ps 29 to Ps 96.

In comparison with the early corpus of YHWH's kingship, Pss 93, 96-99 forms a later corpus of YHWH kingship texts belonging to the Jerusalem temple. This later corpus widens the sphere of divine kingship to a universalistic perspective and shifts from warrior mythology to creator mythology to establish that kingship. Finally, Pss 93,

96-99 are later in date than the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts. A later chapter will solidify the Psalms of YHWH's kingship in an 8th century pre-exilic Jerusalemite context.

The question remains what led Israel to formulate YHWH's kingship in the classical forms, moving from a limited warrior king to a universal creator king. The next chapter will offer a methodology for how that question should proceed, allowing the analysis in chapter 4 to explore a suitable historical analogue to further understand this shift.

Chapter Three: Cultural Translation as Method

To answer the question of why Israelite scribes made a significant change to YHWH's kingship requires comparison to similar changes in divinity in the ANE. The methods of comparing the HB with the ANE have experienced various forms.¹⁹⁶ A recent development in comparative methodology offers the method and terminology needed to understand why major shifts in religious expression sometimes occur and is open to the origins of such expressions. The study of cultural translation (CT), or cultural translitivity, is new for HB studies. Originating in social anthropology and informed by linguistic theory, it is the methodological discussion that explores how an ethnographer "translates" the culture he/she is observing to his/her own culture. Very recently, some scholars concerned with HB comparisons with the ANE have adapted this anthropological field for illuminating the developments of divinity in ancient Israel. The following will summarize CT within Israelite religious studies, critique its limited use of CT and—informed by a broader and more recent knowledge of CT in anthropology—develop a method of CT that can be used for studying the shift in YHWH's kingship.

¹⁹⁶ Malul's distinctions between anthropological and historical parallels are an important turning point; Meir Malul, *The Comparative Method in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Legal Studies* (Germany: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1990). He shifted the question from proving *if* a borrowing took place to asking *how* it took place. If the *how* is explained, then the *if* is more likely. The question of *how* emerges with four possibilities when comparing texts A and B. 1. There is a direct connection between the texts (defined as a oral or written source) A and B that implies the scribe writing text B had a copy or accurate oral tradition of text A. This type indicates an historical connection even though there may still be a discrepancy in dates between the texts. The larger the chronological gap between the texts studied, the more a historical connection is questioned. 2. There is a mediated connection to explain the correspondence between texts A and B. Either the scribe of text B copied a secondary text (text C) which itself contained a portion of text A; or text A originated in culture X, it was reproduced for some time in culture Y, and the scribe of text B who exists in culture Z copied the text from his interaction with culture Y even though he had no interaction with culture X which was the source culture of text A. 3. Texts A and B correspond because they derive from a common source assumed to be much earlier than both texts A and B and known to both. This assumption allows for a time of dissemination if texts A and B are removed geographically, chronologically, or culturally. 4. Texts A and B derive from a common tradition in the ANE and thus may have less explicit linguistic connections and have more conceptual parallels or narrative structures.

Cultural Translation in Israelite Religion

Many scholars researching the comparative ancient Near East have recognized that concepts, and specifically deities, are transferred from one culture to another: Baal in the Levant has clear overlap with Seth in Egypt (likely since Seth had some connection with the outskirts of Egypt); similarly Bes moves from Egypt to Mesopotamia. These overlaps are generally accepted, but rarely explored in and of themselves by biblical scholars unless they provide an interpretive solution for a given biblical text.

Recently, a small group of scholars in Israelite religion have defined translatability as the cross-cultural equation, not translation, of specific deities between neighboring cultures in the ancient Near East. The main focus of this current area is the question of whether translatability was a feature in the Israelite expression; specifically, considering the development of monotheism, did Israelites recognize foreign deities as their own and did this process remain static or change?

Assmann¹⁹⁷ and Hendel¹⁹⁸ believe the Israelites did not engage in cultural translation in a significant way. Their preference is to see Israel as unique from its neighbors whereas the latter freely translated deities from other cultures. Assmann and Hendel prefer an early form of monotheism in the biblical text.¹⁹⁹ In the former case, Assmann calls the Israelite expression in his other works the “Mosaic distinction” where

¹⁹⁷ Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1997).

¹⁹⁸ Ronald Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History of the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹⁹⁹ Hendel cites Assmann in this regard; Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 3-6. While Tigay does not discuss translatability, his work is another example of constructing early Israel as unique from its neighbors; Jeffery H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite religion in Light of Hebrew Inscriptions* (HSS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

the Israelite response looks inward toward its own God rather than looking outward to other divine expressions in the ANE.²⁰⁰

Hendel repeats Israel's uniqueness among its neighbors.²⁰¹ The opening of his study appeals to the Balaam narrative with particular reference to a people dwelling apart in Num 23:7-10, as an early demonstration of Israel's self-defined uniqueness.²⁰² While a brief response was partly laid out in Smith's *Memoirs of God* (2004), in 2008 Smith summarized Hendel and Assmann's use of translatability, adopting Assmann's understanding of CT, and responded.²⁰³ Smith argued that translatability was a process for Israel first at a local level during the monarchy, then at a national level when other national gods were viewed alongside YHWH. Later in Israelite history, Smith identifies the Israelite rejection of translatability, a rejection that formed a basis for monotheism.²⁰⁴

Limitations to Israelite Religion's Use of Cultural Translation

Smith presents the most convincing argument that Israel was not unique among its neighbors and he demonstrates well Israel's use of other divinities to express YHWH.²⁰⁵ Yet must further studies accept the definition and use of CT as Smith has applied it to Israelite religion based on his response to Assmann? Smith summarizes Assmann's use of

²⁰⁰ For discussion, see Mark S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (FAT 57; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 7-10.

²⁰¹ Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 30.

²⁰² Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 6. For discussion, see Smith, *God in Translation*, 94. Machinist discusses these and similar texts and proposes they are a type of "counter-identity" to more established cultures around them; Peter Machinist, "Distinctiveness in Ancient Israel: An Essay," in *Ah Assyria...Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (ed. M. Cogan and I. Eph'al; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991), 196-212.

²⁰³ Smith, *God in Translation*, 5-10.

²⁰⁴ Smith repeats these conclusions in Mark S. Smith, "God in Translation: Cross Cultural Recognition of Divinity in Ancient Israel," in *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism* (ed. B. Pongratz-Leisten; Wionna Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 241-270. Also see, Mark S. Smith, *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

²⁰⁵ Smith, *God in Translation*, 99-118. The relevant biblical passages which attest to translatability as defined by Smith are Judg 11:24; Gen 31: 43-53; Judg 3:20, 7, 11:24; 1 Kgs 20; 2 Kgs 1; 2 Kings 3.

CT that recognizes the cross-cultural identification of deities. Assmann is not speaking of foreign influence from one culture to another or religious importing of deities.²⁰⁶ Further, Assmann does not mean translating a deity from one culture to another, but recognizing the power of another deity who is not of one's own culture. Texts like 2 Kings 3:27 seem to illustrate this since the Israelites acknowledge the power of Chemosh. Translatability for Assmann, and thus for Smith, is only the cross-cultural recognition of deities. Rightly so, Smith adopts this definition to engage with the dialogue as it exists in Assmann. Given the early stage of this method in HB studies, future studies need not maintain this limited definition of CT, since an understanding of CT in its field of origin is a wider notion than Smith and Assmann propose.²⁰⁷ The roots of CT in anthropology can inform future applications of the method for comparative study in Israelite religion.

Two points of Smith's use of CT clarify how this study differs and why Smith and Assmann's use of CT need not be retained. First, Smith's work and application of translatability is broad. Smith deals with a wide range of deities in Israel from the Late Bronze period through the Greco-Roman period as well as Judaism and early Christianity. This is not a criticism of Smith but a point of difference from this study. If the use of CT is to be pursued as a method for the study of the HB in comparative contexts, it will be beneficial for a study to apply the framework to a more specific topic. Subsequently, when this "new" method is applied to an increasing amount of specific test cases, the method can be further refined. In this study we acknowledge that the kingship

²⁰⁶ Smith, *God in Translation*, 6-7.

²⁰⁷ Those working in Assyriology have given some attention to cultural translation. Some have referred to the similar "intercultural transfer of ideologies"; Beate Pongratz-Leisten, "Lying King and False Prophet: the Intercultural Transfer of a Rhetorical Device within Ancient Near Eastern Ideologies," in *Ideologies and Intercultural Phenomena* (ed. A. Panaino and G. Pettinato; Milano: Universita di Bologna & Isiao), 216.

of YHWH is just one test case. It is the beginning development of CT as a method for Israelite Religion and perhaps biblical studies more broadly. After a series of more focused topics have utilized CT, each study can reflect upon and examine the method's contributions and limitations.

Second, Smith (who has discussed translatability for Israelite religion more than anyone) uses the concept in a book-length study and offers a one-page analysis of its roots in anthropology.²⁰⁸ Smith has used what he has needed of CT to engage with Assmann, and has briefly (and helpfully for the first time in our field) situated the discussion of translation in anthropology. Despite this, his definition is narrower than the range of possibilities CT can offer. In accordance with Assmann, Smith states: "In sum, translatability involves specific equations or identifications of deities across cultures and the larger recognition of deities of other cultures in connection to one's own deities".²⁰⁹ CT in its anthropological context comes with more specific terminology and is better suited as a framework to uncover how Israelite scribes engaged in the process of translating divinity from another culture to their own.

In order to understand how CT can progress as a method for HB comparative study, the discussion requires what might seem to be a trip down the rabbit hole. The intention here is to summarize briefly the field of CT, its roots in social anthropology,

²⁰⁸ Smith only uses Geertz and Asad to understand CT in anthropology. While Clifford Geertz (discussed in this chapter) is considered an important anthropologist, and thus Smith cites him, his work is not as important as Asad and Gellner for CT. More recent analyses on CT's use in anthropology invoke Asad, not Geertz. Smith thus only uses Geertz (1999 which is a summary of older scholarship) and Asad (1986) to understand CT. Smith does not trace the development of CT in anthropology beyond Asad's 1986 contribution. Thus there has been 22 years of development in CT that Smith's 2008 study does not engage with. Significantly among these developments is the work of Ghosh (discussed below), whose first major contribution was in 1992 and whose project continues with books as recent as 2008. While Smith also includes some discussion of CT in autobiography (1999), these are not directly related to anthropological discourse about the method and development of CT.

²⁰⁹ Smith, *God in Translation*, 6.

trajectory and its recent developments, in order to ask what the infantile uses of CT by scholarship in Israelite Religion can learn from the past and recent debates about CT in anthropology. Understanding the development that has taken place in anthropology and its current state is essential for forming a useful set of questions to ask of the CT process taking place among Israelite scribes and other scribes of the ANE.

Cultural Translation and its Anthropological Roots

The origins of CT as a method within anthropology have their background in scholars who practiced early forms of ethnography in academic contexts. Often, they used written reports—mostly from missionaries and those of the British Empire involved in trade, business and other colonial activities—and some texts collected from the studied culture. A shift began to occur when ethnographers realized their work could be improved by spending time in the field and among the cultures they studied. Their “texts” now became the culture itself and they could compare cultures in the same way that the historian analyzed textual sources. Despite the transition from studying texts to cultures, in the early stages ethnographers were still considered objective observers merely communicating the results of the culture that they observed.²¹⁰

Another shift in the perception of ethnography occurred when ethnographic expressions were treated in terms of translation. This new formulation, spurred on by Godfrey Lienhardt, questioned the objective roles of ethnographers. Describing the ethnographic project in terms of linguistic theory captured the degree of uncertainty that

²¹⁰ This process should not be foreign for scholars of the ANE since the colonial constructions of Orientalism still predominate the nomenclature we employ. We need only consider the phrase “ancient near east”; that is, the ancient world is “east” of the British empire which itself is the centre. The assumptions that Britain is the centre of the colonized world (as Babylon constructed itself as the centre of the ANE) and the periphery is un-colonized, are evident in much of the discourse that dominated early discoveries. For a recent collection of essays discussing such issues, see Steven W. Holloway ed., *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible* (HBM 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007).

was beginning to be recognized in ethnography. Lienhardt said: “The problem of describing to others how members of a remote tribe think then begins to appear largely as one of translation, of making the coherence primitive thought has in the languages it really lives in, as clear as possible in our own.”²¹¹

The discussion of ethnography as a type of translation would continue in various forms until there was a significant articulation of it by Gellner²¹² that motivated a response by Asad.²¹³ Gellner sought a strict form and method of CT in which the expression in the source culture must be given an exact translation to the target culture. He argued that allowing a concept from the source/studied culture not to have a suitable reference in the target culture must be eliminated. For Gellner *charity in translation* represented a lack of discipline in ethnography. In particular, Gellner was responding to what he constructed as “unacceptable views [that] lead to relativism and fail in an attempt to account for the world.”²¹⁴

Asad argued for the necessity of *charity in translation* but situated that charity in a context. For Asad “the anthropologist’s translation is not merely a matter of matching

²¹¹ Godfrey Lienhardt, “Modes of Thought,” in *The Institutions of Primitive Society* (E. E. Evans-Pritchard et al., eds.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1954), 97. We will use the language common to LXX studies to describe the facets of CT; the “source culture” is where the expression actually occurred. This is akin to the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX. The “target culture” is the location where the expression in the source culture is translated. This is akin to the Greek of the LXX that is target language for the translators.

²¹² Ernest Gellner, “Concepts and Society,” in *Rationality: Key Concepts in the Social Sciences* (ed. Bryan R. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), 18-49.

²¹³ Talal Asad, “The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology,” in *Genealogies of Religion: Disciplines and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 171-99.

²¹⁴ John Wettersten, “Ernest Gellner: A Wittgensteinian Rationalist,” in *The Social Philosophy of Ernest Gellner* (ed. J. A. Hall and I. C. Jarvie; PPSH 48; Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996), 507. While various disciplines continue to find the anthropological discussion of cultural translation informative, there are critiques to the project. Timothy Ingold, “The Art of Translation in a Continuous World,” in *Beyond Boundaries: Understanding, Translation and Anthropological Discourse* (ed. G. Palisson; Oxford: Berg, 1994), 210-30. To Ingold, the idea of constructing cultures through translation is to assume cultures are made up of discreet units. Ingold views this assumption as an anthropological invention. Yet Ingold is assuming the project of cultural translation envisions neat categories. For other reasons Ingold misunderstands the project; see the critique of Ingold by Shirley Ann Jordon, “Ethnographic Encounters: The Process of Cultural Translation, Language and Intercultural Communication,” *LIC* 2 (2002): 96-110.

sentences in the abstract, but of *learning to live another form of life* and speak another kind of language”.²¹⁵ The shift Asad brought to CT accounts for the realities of cultures living together and formulates CT with reference to those realities. The shift is away from the objective observer to the ethnographer completing her/his task by becoming immersed in a cultural context. *Charity of translation* is a necessary reality that understands CT as best articulated when the translator and the “text” they are translating exist in a shared context.

Asad’s shift to making CT more about organic moments of CT more closely reflects the situation in which Israelite scribes found themselves. The scribes’ task was never one of intentionally translating Egyptian and Mesopotamian religion to their own so Israelites could understand surrounding cultures (akin to older forms of ethnography). For example, HB scholars do not argue that Israelite scribal use of the *miš pī* ritual in Isa 6 is to communicate to Israelites the details of this Mesopotamian rite.²¹⁶ Rather translation took place as a consequence of living together. Similar to Asad’s construction of CT, ancient scribes formulated their own expressions of divinity from their shared Semitic matrix, as well as adopted, responded to, and adapted expressions of divinity surrounding them.²¹⁷

²¹⁵ Asad, “The Concept of Cultural Translation,” 180. My emphasis.

²¹⁶ Victor A. Hurowitz, “Isaiah’s Unpure Lips and Their Purification in Light of Akkadian Sources,” *HUCA* 60 (1989): 39-89.

²¹⁷ The development of scribal expressions within a specific cultural matrix is even more pronounced given the likelihood of scribal schools and their multi-lingual education. See the discussion in Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 52-74. For an alternate view of scribal culture that suggests the written sources are limited and thus Israelite culture is more oral, see Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 39-58. Carr takes an oral-literary approach and suggests texts were both copied and memorized. See, David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005). For a more positive view of early Israelite scribal traditions and the occurrence of most writing in the First Temple period, see William M. Schniedewind, *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 24-34. For an argument that the alphabetic writings

Another contribution of Asad to CT, *coherence*, is a concept called, initiated by Lienhardt. Before undertaking the translation of an expression from one culture to another, one must first explore the expression in the source culture and “that which makes its social affect such a powerful possibility”.²¹⁸ Thus *coherence* is simply asking why the expression in the source culture came to exist and why it has meaning for the source culture. Important here is the degree of importance an expression has in the source culture and whether or not the translator properly represents its importance in their translation. One must guard against misrepresenting the expression’s degree of importance if the translation is to be both representative and affective. That degree of importance the expression has in the source culture can be termed *resonance*.²¹⁹ *Coherence* (aware of degrees of *resonance*) provides reasons why the expression in the source culture came to prominence and thus why a target culture picked up the expression.²²⁰ The study of *coherence* supplies a motivation for moments of CT.

CT’s awareness of why an expression becomes prominent in the source culture is a suitable starting description for what is occurring with Israelite scribes who engage in CT. If Israelite scribes developed Mesopotamian expressions of divinity, one must understand why the kingship of the deity arose in a culture like Mesopotamia and its degree of importance there, before understanding why and how the target culture developed the expression. What religious and political factors gave that expression power

were accessible to more than just scribes, see Seth Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2009). Also see Alan R. Millard, “The Practice of Writing in Ancient Israel” *BA* 35 (1972): 98-111; Alan R. Millard, “In Praise of Ancient Scribes” *BA* (1982): 143-53.

²¹⁸ Asad, “The Concept of Cultural Translation,” 185.

²¹⁹ This is my term to describe the degree of effect and dissemination the studied expression had in the source culture.

²²⁰ The ethnographer must make sure that the concept they are translating is not given more emphasis in the source culture than the source culture gives to it. Roger M. Keesing, “Conventional Metaphors and Anthropological Metaphysics: The Problematic of Cultural Translation,” *JAR* 41 (1985): 201-217.

in Mesopotamian culture before Israelite scribes utilized it?

Cultural Translation and Amitav Ghosh

In response to scholarship in Israelite Religion that has not developed CT with reference to its roots and current formulations in anthropology, we come to the work of Amitav Ghosh and recent developments of CT in anthropology and related fields. While Asad provides helpful terminology and developments, Ghosh further develops the need to envision the ethnographer as influenced by a culture and raises awareness of the motivations behind moments of CT.

Ghosh graduated from Oxford in social anthropology²²¹ and his PhD thesis and subsequent work is the most current contribution to CT that has received attention from a variety of disciplines, particularly from anthropology and post-colonial studies.²²² Despite his contributions to CT none of Ghosh's work has been used to inform scholars of Israelite religion in their use of CT, nor has Ghosh been used in ANE or biblical studies in general. Ghosh's PhD thesis²²³ was published as the non-fiction work, in *In an Antique Land*.²²⁴ Turning ones PhD dissertation in the humanities into a popular selling non-fiction work is an accomplishment that cannot be underestimated. Given its accessible format and its broad range of influence on multiple disciplines, like the work of Said or Frazer, Ghosh's work must be taken seriously for future uses of CT in biblical

²²¹ Asad received his PhD from Oxford at St. Edmund's hall in 1982. Since then he has been a visiting professor at the American University in Cairo, Columbia and Harvard Universities among others.

²²² A leading anthropologist Clifford Geertz's has reviewed Ghosh's work. Clifford Geertz, "Review of Amitav Ghosh *In an Antique Land*," *The Australian* (August 25, 1993): 30.

²²³ Amitav Ghosh, "Kinship in Relation to the Economic and Social Organization of an Egyptian Village Community" (Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1981).

²²⁴ Amitav Ghosh, *In an Antique Land: History in the Guise of a Traveler's Tale* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992).

and ancient Near Eastern studies.²²⁵

In an Antique Land narrates Ghosh's own experience as an Indian,²²⁶ living in Egypt during his PhD research into an 11th century Jewish trader (Ben Yijû) and the trader's Indian slave recorded in the Cairo Genizah documents.²²⁷ The structure of *In An Antique Land* is set out in a series of juxtaposed chapters; in some chapters Ghosh describes his time in Egypt as an ethnographer and reflects upon his interaction with a strange culture,²²⁸ while in others he explains the more technical ethnographical work of reconstructing the life of an Indian slave belonging to Ben Yijû.²²⁹ Exploring the work of the ethnographer and cultural translator, Ghosh narrates both how he is undertaking new directions in CT for his dissertation and how he is engaging in CT in his own intercultural experiences during research.²³⁰ As the book progresses the narrative of his scholarly work and the narrative of his own cultural experiences begin to weave together and comment on each-other, developing a thesis and reality of what CT is versus what Ghosh expected it to be.²³¹

²²⁵ Subsequently this work has been translated and published in Italian, German and French. Its English edition has won the New York Times Notable Book of the Year award in 1993. It was also the subject of TV documentary by BBC III in 1992.

²²⁶ Ghosh was born in Calcutta in 1956.

²²⁷ Ghosh's technical study of this project was published as Amitav Ghosh, "The Slave of Ms H.6," *SS* 7 (1992): 159-220. The letters that formed the textual basis for the study, now in the National and University Library in Jerusalem, were written by a merchant, Khalaf ibn Ishaq for his friend Abraham Ben Yijû.

²²⁸ The bases of these chapters are drawn from Ghosh's PhD thesis; Amitav Ghosh, *Kinship in Relation to the Economic and Social Organization of an Egyptian Village Community*.

²²⁹ The basis of these chapters is drawn from Amitav Ghosh, "The Slave of Ms H.6".

²³⁰ The fact that Ghosh is attempting a shift in the discipline of anthropology and ethnography is well known. "Ghosh's quest for an alternative history. . . is accompanied by the quest for an alternative anthropology: these two disciplines can be seen as the diachronic and synchronic settings, respectively, of his chosen representation of Egypt. . . [Thus one must see] the importance of the narrative element for his rewriting of an ethnographical and historical account in a style far removed from the traditional academic boundaries set for these two types of writing"; Neelam Srivastava, "Amitav Ghosh's Ethnographic Fictions: Intertextual Links between *In an Antique Land* and His Doctoral Thesis," *JCL* (2001): 47.

²³¹ Claire Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation: Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*," *PT* 2.3 (2006): 2.

It is important for scholars of Israelite Religion and the ancient Near East to be aware that Ghosh's work is not a minor contribution. In the 20-year period since Ghosh's 1992 *In an Antique Land*, his works have clearly captured popular and scholarly attention; two critical readers of Ghosh's work have been edited as well as an introduction to his work, along with a myriad of scholarly articles on the influence of Ghosh for philosophy, anthropology, post-colonial theory and CT.²³² He is considered the foremost Indian writer post-Rushdie.

Ghosh and Contributions to Cultural Translation

Ghosh's work is a progression of CT and a development from Asad as a reflection on the role of the ethnographer as translator which contributes to the motivations for moments of CT.²³³ One main shift from Asad to Ghosh is set within a crisis in anthropology that continues to question the role of the ethnographer. While Ghosh, like Asad, sets the ethnographer in the cultural context and removes seeming objectivity, Ghosh does not maintain a situation where the ethnographer eventually learns the culture so she/he may communicate it objectively.²³⁴ Rather, Ghosh prefers to explore cultural

²³² For an excellent overview of Ghosh's influence and critics see, Anshuman A. Mondal, *Amitav Ghosh: Contemporary World Writers* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), 163-179. Other works that demonstrate Ghosh's influence are: Tabish Khair ed., *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Companion* (New Delhi: Pauls Press, 2003); Om P. Dwivedi ed. *The Fiction of Amitav Ghosh: An Assessment* (Jaipur, Rajasthan: Book Enclave, 2009); John C. Hawley, *Amitav Ghosh: An Introduction* (New Delhi: Foundation Books, 2005); Javed Majeed, "Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*: The Ethnographer-Historian and the Limits of Irony," *JCL* 30:2 (1995): 45-55; A. Soueif, "Review of *In an Antique Land*," *TLS* 15 January 1993; Shubha Tiwari, *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Study* (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2003); Robert Dixon, "Traveling in the West': The Writing of Amitav Ghosh," *JCL* 31.1 (1996): 3-24; Claire Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation: Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*," *PT* 2.3 (2006): 1-19; Claire Chambers, "History as Fiction, Fiction as History: Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*," in *The Fiction of Amitav Ghosh: An Assessment*. (ed. O.P. Dwivedi Jaipur, Rajasthan: Book Enclave, 2009), 51-91.

²³³ Arguing against Gellner, Asad explains that "it is not the abstract logical status of concepts that is relevant here, but the way in which a specific political (or religious) discourse that employs them seems to mobilize or direct the behavior of people within given situations"; Talal Asad, "The Concept of Cultural Translation," 185.

²³⁴ "Ghosh indicates that knowledge of the Other can only ever be partial, subjective, and historically conditioned. Grand narratives are rejected in favor of "rich confusions" (*Antique* 288)"; Claire Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation," 2.

situations in which CT is actually taking place between the ethnographer and the culture. In many ways the ethnographer loses control of the project and is formed by the culture she/he studies. In these contexts, Ghosh/the ethnographer (or in other work the fictional narrator) is thrust into situations of organic CT. CT is already taking place in immediate interaction, rather than CT mediated through the scholars' desk.²³⁵ Thus Ghosh's task, while from a different time period than the ancient Near East, sets the project of the ethnographer in a more realistic sphere. Ghosh's adaption of CT is more reflective of what was likely taking place in ancient scribal culture.

Space only permits to specify Ghosh's contributions to CT as most relevant for our current topic. Although his work, especially *In an Antique Land*, will provide a matrix of connections for those working in ancient Near Eastern studies, this study will focus on that one novel and one event in it that demonstrates Ghosh's contributions to the task of CT. The goal is to summarize Ghosh's contributions combined with past anthropological developments of CT to form a set of principals/observations of how CT occurs. These questions can then be applied to Israelite scribes and their roles in translating cultures and developing the expression of YHWH as king.

Various episodes in *In an Antique Land* have been identified as illustrative of Ghosh's contributions to ethnography.²³⁶ The Cairo Genizah (synagogue of Ben Ezra) contained manuscripts relating to the Indian slave Ghosh was trying to reconstruct.²³⁷

²³⁵ "Many theorists have interpreted this to be a productive, benign process, in which the ethnographer's own language is altered and enriched by the encounter with foreign words and concepts," Claire Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation," 3.

²³⁶ Dixon identifies several including Ghosh's interaction with an Egyptian Imam and the description of the Cairo Genizah; Dixon, "Traveling in the West: The Writing of Amitav Ghosh," 9-35.

²³⁷ The Cairo Genizah contained over 200,000 manuscripts. Relevant for biblical scholars were the oldest Hebrew manuscripts of Sirach. Pancratius C. Beentjes, ed., *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997). The Mss are now spread between Manchester, Cambridge

Ghosh's description of his visit to the Genizah illustrates well his contributions to CT. For seventeen pages Ghosh describes (compiled from reports, letters and personal correspondence) how the Genizah was stripped of its manuscripts for the benefit of western scholarship and reflects on this process in relation to power structures and assumptions of Orientalism.

Primary among Ghosh's advancements in CT is the role of political and military power in the process of translating knowledge from one culture to another.²³⁸ In this account, the British Empire's ideas of advancing scholarship (rooted in British imperialism and its universal tendencies) are translated into the culture that guarded the Genizah for so long. The Middle Eastern protectors of the Cairo Genizah eventually partake in literally stripping the Genizah's knowledge since the empire has inevitably influenced the culture. Thus Ghosh gives more attention to the instigators of CT. Political and military tensions become primary for Ghosh in what motivates moments of CT. Ghosh's description of the Genizah is framed by the expansionist project of Europeans in the 1700's, the role of Napoleon, and the European interest in ancient Egypt which for years left the Genizah virtually unnoticed. Ghosh narrates how Jacob Saphir (a collector of Jewish antiquities) visited it in 1864, received approval from a Rabbinical court to access the Genizah despite the protests of the local caretakers, and found in it manuscripts full to two and a half stories in height. As Ghosh traces the colonization of the Genizah, he precedes the events by describing them as follows: "events began to

and the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. For the Genizah's relationship to Dead Sea Scrolls research and the correspondence of section markings in Jeremiah (2QJer; 4QJer) and the Damascus Documents found there, see Joseph M. Baumgartner, Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

²³⁸ Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation," 1-19.

unfold quietly around it in a sly allegory on the intercourse between power and the writing of history”.²³⁹ Ghosh connects the series of events surrounding the Genizah to military and commercial forces evident within Orientalism rooted in British imperialism.²⁴⁰ This project included Europeans and ironically Jews, under the guise of advancing Western scholarship, who stripped the Cairo Genizah. By tracing all the cultures involved in removing the documents, part of Ghosh’s point is that situations of CT are rooted in struggles over power. The Eurocentric understanding of advancing knowledge at the cost of stripping a Genizah becomes translated into other cultures since local cultures participate in this endeavor. Local cultures participate since they are motivated by the political, military and trade realities of the day that Ghosh describes. Ghosh reflects on this situation as an Indian trained in the European scholarly method, himself translating those cultural realities in his work, while reflecting on his own scholarly assumptions which are similar to the ancient situation of the Cairo Genizah. Thus Clifford notes of Ghosh: “The Third World anthropologist now conceives his research as extending a long history of intercultural relations, contacts not defined by European expansion or the dichotomy of East and West.”²⁴¹

Political and military power as instigators of CT are not limited to one event in *In an Antique Land*. This aspect is highlighted in the Genizah account while military power permeates and frames this work. Setting the context for the Indian slave Ghosh is trying to uncover, the novel begins with an explanation of the letter mentioning the slave, written in 1148 CE, and thus sets the event in a context of the Crusader armies in Damascus in the summer of 1148 CE. The novel then ends with the conclusion of

²³⁹ Ghosh, *In an Antique Land*, 82.

²⁴⁰ Dixon “Traveling in the West,” 31-32.

²⁴¹ James Clifford, “Looking for Bomma,” *LRB* 24 March 1994, 27.

Ghosh's research on the eve of the Gulf war. Throughout the novel, political and military powers are always in the backdrop. These events motivate and propel moments of CT in the narrative.²⁴²

Ghosh's discussion of the Genizah is a commentary on the past but also on the project of anthropology. In particular, Ghosh's description is a commentary on, and solution for the proper role between historiography and ethnography.²⁴³ Ghosh's reflection on what is being done with the Cairo Genizah also encompasses his own reflections on his training as an anthropologist. In his description he comes to a realization of what he is also engaged in. As we saw, Asad sought more subjectivity in the process than Gellner, but still maintained the objectivity of the translator since the translator's goal remains to translate the foreign culture to his or her own.²⁴⁴ Ghosh's response is to break open the objectivity of the translator/ethnographer/narrator and show how they are inevitably affected by the culture they hope to translate.²⁴⁵ In some cases this takes place through Ghosh relating his own ethnographic experiences in *In an Antique Land*. At other times one of his fictional novels demonstrates how a crew in *Sea of Poppies* affects a merchant sailor.²⁴⁶

²⁴² Another example of military and political situations motivating CT is in the film *Lawrence of Arabia*. Its release in 1962 seemed to anticipate much of what would occur in the discussion of CT in anthropology. This film was based on the historical figure T.E. Lawrence, who occupied a liaison role between the British Army and the Arab revolt during 1916-18. His autobiography was published as *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* in 1922.

²⁴³ Neelam Srivastava, "Amitav Ghosh's Ethnographic Fictions: Intertextual Links between *In an Antique Land* and His Doctoral Thesis," *JCL* (2001): 45-64.

²⁴⁴ "All good translation seeks to reproduce the structure of an alien discourse within the translator's own language. How that structure (or coherence) is produced will depend on the genre concerned. . ."; Asad, "The Concept of Cultural Translation," 198.

²⁴⁵ "[T]he ethnographer still has to translate their lives through the act of writing. In parallel with the work of theorists of history like Hayden White, these so-called 'New Anthropologists'—who include James Clifford, Talal Asad, and Mary Louise Pratt—have sought to locate ethnography as a textualized construction," Chambers, "Anthropology as Cultural Translation," 1-19.

²⁴⁶ In 2007, Mondal, in explaining the great influence and success of Ghosh in Britain, says Ghosh's success was not high enough to be nominated for the Man Booker prize. Anshuman A. Mondal,

Before Ghosh's work, Larsen suggested that in order for CT to take place the society to which the idea is being translated must be self-critical.²⁴⁷ Ghosh would achieve what Larsen anticipated. Ghosh both explores the self-criticism of the ethnographer and, implied in this, criticizes British/Western matrices of knowledge, power and imperialism. In juxtaposed chapters he takes on the self-criticism as an Indian and his perception of Arab reactions to his customs and traditions.²⁴⁸ Thus self-criticism opens one up to moments of CT. Typical in Ghosh's work is for the outsider to engage a culture by trying to explain it, but as the work progresses, that outsider begins to translate the culture in his/her own language since he/she goes through the process of self-criticism.

Ghosh's developments to CT are instructive for Israelite Religion trying to use CT. For Ghosh, moments of CT do not take place without reference to who is in power and the effects that person's role has on CT. The observation of this element of CT is no less applicable to the role of the Neo-Assyrian empire in the cultural translations of Israelite scribes. While studies have long recognized the Israelite response to Assyrian presence as a mitigating factor in the expression of Israelite scribal production, the detailed reflection in anthropology from 1954-2008 provides a more detailed and nuanced reflection on how to trace specific moments of CT.²⁴⁹

Cultural Translation and Its Further Use for Israelite Religion

From studying its development within anthropology, the contributions of CT can be divided into four areas when identifying moments of CT between Israel and the ANE.

Amitav Ghosh, 163. A year later, *Sea of Poppies* was nominated and was the winner of the Man Booker prize; Amitav Ghosh, *Sea of Poppies* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008).

²⁴⁷ Tord Larsen, "Action, Morality, and Cultural Translation," *JAR* 43 (1987): 1-28.

²⁴⁸ This is evident in a debate between Arabs and Ghosh who attempts to explain that there are those from his country who are not circumcised; Ghosh, *In an Antique Land*, 62.

²⁴⁹ Ghosh's most recent contribution is Ghosh, *Sea of Poppies*.

- 1) *Motivations*. The preceding discussion of CT, especially informed by Ghosh and those reflecting on his work, asks a broader question than former studies in HB that have adapted CT. That is, what motivates instances of CT? This question is rooted in first, a broader understanding of CT that is not limited to the cross-cultural equation of deities. Second, the question of motivation is a shift to ask *how* CT occurs rather than *if* it does. In the case of Israelite scribes and the focus of this study: what motivated a major shift in expression of YHWH's kingship? Specifically, what factors motivated Israelite scribes to subsume into YHWH's expression of kingship aspects of other deities, thus elevating YHWH to a universal-creator king?
- 2) *The Source of Motivations*. The anthropological expression of CT, and the observations from Asad, Ghosh, and Chambers' and Dixion's analyses of Ghosh, provide a hint of such motivations. Political and military power and pressures are often catalysts for moments of CT. Smith recognizes the importance of this element as a backdrop of Mesopotamian influence on Israelite theism, but does not further explore it as a motivator for shifts in divinity.²⁵⁰ In particular, British imperialism and its effects that motivated CT are similar to Neo-Assyrian imperialism. Thus, we must ask what was occurring at the time when a CT is in effect and what political or military pressures instigated a CT. Finally, the culture engaging in cultural translation must be open to *self-criticism*. We must look for a

²⁵⁰ Smith, *God in Translation*, 37-90. Smith provides a compelling summary regarding the place of the Assyrian empire in Judah from the eighth to sixth centuries (Smith, *God in Translation*, 149-57). Smith situates the Israelite expression of one-god theism in an Assyrian context and that context as a source of the Israelite expression. Yet the motivations for why Israel reacted this way are not provided and Smith's study is more concerned with the broader and later topic of monotheism. Rather, this study focuses on the earlier and more specific topic of YHWH's kingship. This study will situate the changes of YHWH's kingship in reaction to Assyrian political and religious presence.

moment in a society when *self-criticism* of its own institutions and structures opens the door for moments of CT.

- 3) *Coherence and Resonance*. From Asad we have learned to ask: before a concept of one culture is translated into another, what makes the concept's "social effect such a powerful possibility"²⁵¹ in the original culture? For the purposes of this study we will use the term *resonance* to describe what Asad is identifying. The degree of *resonance* cannot be determined without truly understanding the function and purpose of the expression in the source culture. This is known as the related idea expressed by Lienhardt as *coherence*.²⁵² Once *coherence* and *resonance* are determined, one has better reason to see how/why the expression could be translated into the target culture. The moment of CT thus intersects with *motivations*, since the target culture (Israel) would not likely translate an expression to its own culture when two elements are absent: first, if the expression did not have *resonance* in the source culture (Mesopotamia), and second, if there were not a motivating reason to make the translation. One must understand the expression in the source culture and why the expression gained prominence in its own context before constructing its meaning for Israelite culture and why its expression of YHWH as king gained prominence in Israelite circles. Specifically, why did the shift of Marduk's divinity occur in Babylonian culture? Thus "it is not the abstract logical status of concepts that is relevant here, but the way in which a specific political (or religious) discourse that employs them seems to

²⁵¹ Asad, "The Concept of Cultural Translation," 185.

²⁵² "The problem of describing to others how members of a remote tribe think then begins to appear largely as one of translation, of making the coherence primitive thought has in the languages it really lives in, as clear as possible in our own"; Lienhardt, "Modes of Thought," 97.

mobilize or direct the behavior of people within given situations.”²⁵³

- 4) *Charity in translation*. Since Israelite scribes are not attempting to communicate elements in other cultures to their own, but rather existing in a shared culture, when studying CT in Israelite religion we must be aware of their charity in translation and also have charity in translation when expressing situations of CT. We do not need the expression in one culture to be exactly the same expression in another in order to consider it a moment of CT. We only need a rough approximation since one has to account for the unique features of an expression that would naturally occur once translated to the target culture.²⁵⁴ In this case, most parallels are conceptual and not linguistic.

The task will be to use these elements as a guide to explore the specific issue of YHWH’s kingship to answer how YHWH’s kingship became re-expressed and the specific religious, cultural and/or military pressures that motivated the change. This study suggests that the key for understanding the shift in expression of YHWH’s kingship is attention to similar shifts in the other ANE expressions of kingly divinity that form an instructive historical analogy for the situation in the Levant during Neo-Assyrian occupation. In accordance with the question of *coherence* already discussed, chapter 4 identifies what made the kingship of Marduk such a substantial Babylonian expression in the *Enūma eliš*. Chapter 4 also seeks the *motivations* of that expression in Babylonian culture and asks the political, religious and military pressures that led to the expression,

²⁵³ Asad, “The Concept of Cultural Translation,” 185.

²⁵⁴ For example, when Baal is translated into Egyptian culture through the God Seth, Seth retains aspects of his Egyptian expression like not gaining kingship while Baal succeeds in this. Despite such difference, no one argues that Baal and Seth are not a moment of intercultural exchange. Herman te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of His Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion* (Probleme der Ägyptologie. Leiden: Brill, 1967).

specifically with reference to Middle-Assyrian military pressure on Babylonian literary culture and situating the *Enūma eliš* as a reaction to Assyrian presence.

The analysis in chapter 5 will then apply these same questions to the Israelite expression of YHWH as king and identify the possible Israelite scribal translation of Marduk to expressions of YHWH. Since CT occurs within power structures, the study will ask how Assyrian military presence in the Levant had a similar impact on Israelite literary traditions as it did on Babylonian traditions. Israelite scribes shifted their expression of YHWH from a minor to a major form of kingship similar to the Babylonian experience of changes to Marduk's kingship.

After these observations are applied to the specific question of YHWH's kingship, they can be critiqued, refined and modified. Once a framework is set out on how CT operates among Israelite scribes in one area of expression, it can be applied to subsequent comparative moments and adapted or modified when appropriate. Beyond this study, the more CT is applied to individual comparative moments, the more the framework can be tested and improved. Subsequent applications will eventually reflect a wider range of comparative situations and continually reflect a more accurate representation of the Israelite scribes. This study is a step in that larger project.

Chapter Four: The Origins of New Israelite Expressions for YHWH's Kingship

Introduction

Against scholarly assumptions that YHWH's kingship was, primarily, a static Israelite expression, the discussion in chapter 2 established early and late YHWH kingship texts and demonstrated clear differences between them. In order to explain why the shift from one expression of YHWH's kingship to another occurred, the methodological approach of cultural translation (CT) was introduced. Compared to the very recent uses of CT in the field of Israelite religion, the last chapter provided more specific methodological vantage points to approach the question of change, by re-orientating CT towards its anthropological roots. Features of CT such as *coherence*, *resonance* and *motivations* led to a specific line of inquiry: what is the meaning of the expression in the source culture (*coherence*) and what was the significance of the expression (*resonance*) in the source culture before understanding why (*motivations*) it was translated into the target culture? We found that translations are motivated by moments of military and political pressure.²⁵⁵ The following analysis proposes: a) that external pressures led to the particular expression of Marduk in the *Enūma elīš* and b) that Marduk's divinity in that poem forms the basis of a suitable analogy to the similar rise of YHWH's kingship in Israel.

The uniqueness of Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma elīš* and its *resonance* through wide attestation and cultural influences demonstrates the *coherence* of his elevation.

²⁵⁵ The expression of Marduk in Babylon is not a translation, since the expression of Marduk in the source culture is unique to the ANE. Using CT as a guide, this chapter argues the expression of Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma elīš* also responds to political and military pressures. The context that motivated Marduk's kingship, then forms an analogy for understanding how Marduk's kingship was translated to YHWH.

Based on insights from CT and its discussion of *motivations*, we will argue in this chapter that a probable date for the motivations leading to the *Enūma eliš* and the final rise of Marduk is not during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in response to Kassite rule, but in response to Assyrian pressures under Tukulti-Ninurta I.

The *Enūma eliš*

It seems that the *Enūma eliš* is primarily a creation story, given its two stories of creation, and thus its modern name the “Babylonian Epic of Creation”. Biblical scholars have assumed this focus as well and have always spoken about the *Enūma eliš* in relation to biblical creation accounts.²⁵⁶ Yet the real focus of the poem is a unique expression of Marduk in the form of a warrior-king, responsible for creation and his rising to a new, elevated status. Recognizing Marduk’s kingship as the primary focus of the poem re-orientates comparative opportunities towards the HB. A brief plot outline demonstrates this primary focus.

The epic begins with creation. Tiamat (the sea embodiment of chaos) and Apsû mingle in an ancient form of copulation and bring forth pairs of gods from within their waters. The purpose of the poem is sharply indicated by the focus on Nudimmud/Ea (a syncretism of these deities in the poem) in I.15. The brief summary of other gods is interrupted by a more extended praise for Nudimmud/Ea, who will become Marduk’s

²⁵⁶ Two examples of biblical scholarship focusing on the Babylonian poem and its relation to biblical creation accounts are Kenton L. Sparks, “Enuma Elish and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism,” *JBL* 126 (2007): 625-648 and Bernard F. Batto, “Creation Theology in Genesis,” in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions* (ed. R. J. Clifford and J. J. Collins; CBQMS 24; Washington: CBA, 1992), 16-38. Batto does give some attention to the *Enūma eliš* in its own context and suggests it was written to supplant the Atrahasis myth.

father.²⁵⁷ Creation is not the focus, but only serves as a background to highlighting the origins of Marduk. Then, Apsû is annoyed with the noise of the younger gods and threatens them. In response Ea destroys Apsû with a magic spell and builds his house on the Apsû. Here Ea and his consort Damkina beget Marduk from the waters of the dead Apsû and thus finalize the supplanting of Apsû's kingship over the waters, again introducing another focus of the poem and hinting at the future position of Marduk. The continued orientation of the poem is reinforced by another extended praise, but this time of Marduk in I 79-104. The two extended praises of Nudimmud/Ea and Marduk make the purpose clear. The story of the gods' origins acts as a foil to communicate the larger theme of Marduk's ascendancy. Now Tiamat, at first with some hesitation but now enraged by her husband's death and the continued noise, eventually sets out to destroy the younger gods. She becomes a formidable enemy of the gods with a host of demons under her command. Marduk offers to battle her, yet places a condition on the gods that he will only do so if he is given kingship over the gods. After they grant this kingship, Marduk takes up the battle, destroys Tiamat and her monsters, and creates heaven and earth by splitting Tiamat in half.

Reading the story against the Babylonian and Assyrian landscape of the day, creation only forms a backdrop to the more important topic of Marduk's divinity, the rise of Marduk and the expression of his kingship.²⁵⁸ The cultural battles of the day, competing cultural/cultic centers, and the notable rise of Marduk prior to the *Enūma eliš*,

²⁵⁷ For more discussion, see Wilfred G. Lambert, "Mesopotamian Creation Stories," in *Imagining Creation* (ed. Markham J. Geller and Mineke Schipper; ISJ Studies in Judaica 5; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 19, 26.

²⁵⁸ For this position, which is a point of agreement in Assyriology, see "Epic of Creation," translated by Benjamin R. Foster (*COS* 1.111: 390-402).

all suggest divinity, not creation, as the primary theme. While the first account of creation serves as a background to the main story, the second story of creation is merely a consequence of Marduk defeating Tiamat and serves to demonstrate his ordering of the cosmos. After the creation of humans Marduk assigns the gods places. This is a story about Marduk's rise and how he obtained that power, not a story about a power that Marduk has always possessed. Thus the gods appoint Marduk to this position and give him the tablet of destinies; with his sacred temple in the Esagil in Babylon, he is made king, not merely of his own sphere, but of all the gods and of the entire world.²⁵⁹

The Uniqueness of the *Enūma eliš* and Coherence

Marduk's kingship is unique in the *Enūma eliš* because the scribe makes a major shift to Marduk's divinity. Before the OB period Marduk was not a major god. Marduk had no major significance, was not particularly tied with any one aspect of nature, or any one function, that would create a cult of Marduk.²⁶⁰ Despite these beginnings, Marduk's divinity rises, and achieves a final, distinct form in the *Enūma eliš*. Moving from a secondary god to kingship over all the gods was an important development.²⁶¹

²⁵⁹ The promotion of the Esagil as Marduk's temple also demonstrates Marduk's uniqueness since it subverts the Nippur traditions. Before Marduk's rise, Nippur, which was on the sacred hill, was the centre of the world. Marduk then supplants Enlil who was associated with traditions from Nippur. Maul explains: "we are confronted with what must have been, for the tradition-conscious Mesopotamian, an incredible break: Marduk appears in place of Enlil as the king of the gods, and Babylon in place of Nippur as the center of the world. The primeval cosmic axis had shifted from Nippur to Babylon."; Stefan Maul, "The Ancient Middle Eastern Capital City: Reflection and Navel of the World," (trans. Thomas Lampert; trans. of "Die altorientalische Hauptstadt: Abbild und Nabel der Welt," in *Die Orientalische Stadt: kontinuier* (Internationale Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft. 9-10. Mai 1996 in Halle/Saale. Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1997), 109-24. <http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/maul/ancientcapitals.html>

²⁶⁰ It is ambiguous whether Marduk was always associated with Babylon, and grew as Babylon grew, or originated elsewhere and become associated with Babylon. Before he was clearly part of Babylon and part of the pantheon, Marduk did not rule over any other gods. See the discussion in Grant Frame, "My Neighbor's God: Aššur in Babylonia and Marduk in Assyria," *CSMSB* 34 (1999): 5-22. Also see the summary of Marduk in, Abusch, "Marduk," in *DDD* 543-549.

²⁶¹ One example of this elevation is the increased use of Marduk in personal names just before the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I. For example, the name *Marduk-šar-ilāni* "Marduk, king of the gods", dating to the Kassite period (1570-1225 BCE), was found on a cylinder seal. Thus the rise of Marduk was a personal

While the mythological background of Marduk is complex, and could include a variety of influences from Mesopotamia, the *Enūma eliš* clearly gathers in the god Marduk warrior elements taken from Ninurta and the elements of a creator god taken from Enlil.²⁶² More typical in the ANE was to have what Handy calls, when speaking about Ugaritic mythology, “spheres of authority”.²⁶³ Deities were monarchs of their own realms for which they were responsible. While they submitted to the head god, neither did this head have complete control. The head god was, from the beginning, the judge, decision maker, creator and thus the one who balanced the cosmos. Yet head gods often lacked pantheistic elements and especially lacked the role of a warrior.²⁶⁴ In contrast, Marduk of the *Enūma eliš* embodies the elements of warrior from Ninurta and creator

expression before it found more official expression. One could also say that the representation of Marduk in *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi* presents the elevation from a position of personal piety. In *Ludlul*, Marduk is a personal saviour on what seems like a national level, but not on a universal level. While *Ludlul* is also debated in terms of dating, it is likely a Kassite period text. Only two names have been found that correspond with the *Šubši-mešre-Šakan*, mentioned 3 times as the protagonist in the story (III 44; IV 111; IV 119). The name is found in a Kassite period text K 9952 and in a Kassite period legal document during Nazimurutash (1307-1282 BCE); Amar Annus and Alan Lenzi, *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi: The Standard Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer* (SAACT VII; Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2010), xvi-xvii. The vision of Marduk in *Ludlul* corresponds well with the rise in Marduk personal names in the late OB period, in which Marduk is second next to Sin in personal names; Walter von Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks: die Stellung Marduks in der Babylonischen Religion des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Neukirchener (AOAT 213; Verlag: Neukirchen – Vluyn, 1982), 95. Also see Takayoshi Oshima, “The Babylonian God Marduk,” in *The Babylonian World* (ed. Gwendolyn Leick; New York: Routledge, 2007), 349. More details of this rise are discussed in the section on dating the poem.

²⁶² Enlil was the Sumerian head god, along with his son was Ninurta who both had their cults at Nippur. The Nippur traditions were a substantial influence upon Marduk’s divinity in the *Enūma eliš*; see, Wilfred G. Lambert, “Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation,” in *Keilschriftliche Literaturen, Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (ed. K. Hecker and W. Sommerfeld; Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient Band 6; Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag 1986), 55-60. Also see the discussion in Eckart Frahm, “Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere,” *Orient* 45 (2010): 5. For a more in depth and recent discussion of the various traditions used in the *Enūma eliš*, see Lambert, “Mesopotamian Creation Stories,” 18-37.

²⁶³ Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven*, 114.

²⁶⁴ The case of El in Ugarit may be a slight exception but still follows this general trend. From deity lists, epithets and the mythological tradition El is clearly the head deity of the divine council who oversees the family of the gods. Yet El is also endowed with some elements of the warrior as discussed in chapter 1.

from Enlil more typically reserved for different spheres of authority.²⁶⁵ Such warrior and creator attributes are made clear. They include *mu-fir gi-mil-li-šu-nu* (their avenger III.138) showing Marduk as a warrior and also as a creator: *a-ba-tum u₃ ba-nu-u qi-bi li-ik-tu-nu*, “speak destruction or creation [and] it will be fixed” (IV. 22).

Such a combination is expressed in the *Enūma eliš* by the one who controls the “tablet of destinies”.²⁶⁶ Combined with Marduk as creator and warrior, the *Enūma eliš* gives Marduk absolute kingship. It is a kingship that is not only concerned with the realm of the sea, or creation, or even with a certain nation. It is an absolute kingship that is meant to give complete power to Marduk over the gods and the world. Certainly this new expression of divinity also aligned itself with a wider sense of international relations among the ruling powers of the day. Depending on the date given to the *Enūma eliš*, its vision of divinity anticipates or dialogues with the universalistic vision of impending imperialism from the Assyrian empire.²⁶⁷

The translation of an important line in the *Enūma eliš* demonstrates Marduk’s uniqueness. In II 161 and III 62, 120, Marduk wishes to decree fates: *ep-šu pi-ia ki-ma ka-tu-nu-ma ši-ma-ta lu-šim-ma* “[at] the moving of my mouth, let me always fix fates instead of/like you.” In the context of the *Enūma eliš*, *ki-ma ka-tu-nu-ma* should be

²⁶⁵ In the *Enūma eliš* Marduk is presented as the ideal creator who creates humanity through his *nik-la-a-ti* “skillfulness” (VI 38) from *na-ka-lum*. That Marduk is in charge of creation is also implied in his residence in the Esagil. As the centre of the world, it is created so Marduk can take care of the gods housed there. The Esagil is also built on the Apsū, the location of the first creation.

²⁶⁶ The *Enūma eliš* uses Anzu traditions, themselves also about the loss and recovery of the tablet of destinies. For references to this idea in the *Enūma eliš* see I 157; IV 81-82 and 121; IV 122V 69-70. For a discussion of the *Enūma eliš* and its use of Anzu and Ninurta traditions, see Lambert, “Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation,” 55-60.

²⁶⁷ The rise of Assyrian imperialism is overviewed by Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “World Hegemony, 900-300 BCE,” in *A Companion to the Ancient Near East* (ed. D. C. Snell; BCAW; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 48-62.

translated “instead of” rather than “like”.²⁶⁸ The gods have given up their power and Marduk has taken on the roles of warrior and creator. This combination for one deity in a single text is striking at this moment in the ANE. Thus the *coherence* of Marduk for its Babylonian context is a unique expression, pushing the bounds of divinity in Mesopotamia and the ANE.²⁶⁹

Finally, the uniqueness of Marduk’s expression is evident in his act of creation after defeating Tiamat. Lambert has rightly argued that there is something unique to Marduk’s battle against the monsters compared to other battle accounts in Mesopotamia and the ANE.²⁷⁰ Baal establishes his kingship in battle over Yam and in a final battle over Mot; establishing order through battle reinforces Baal’s kingship. Whereas the theme of creation is absent in Baal’s battle and kingship, Marduk crushes Tiamat’s skull, splits her body after studying its form, creates the vault of heaven, creates the shrines of the gods, appoints the times of the year, (IV 123-V 25) and finally pleases his fathers in his act of creation (IV 130). Therefore, the battle then becomes an act of creation. The addition of creation as an element of expressing the divine-warrior king, was an important addition in the elevation of Marduk. The scribe completes the elevation of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš* by expressing divinity in a way that the ANE, from the Nile to the Tigris, had not yet experienced according to our available knowledge.

²⁶⁸ See the discussion by Lambert who argues for the translation “instead of” in Wilfred G. Lambert, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion,” in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek* (ed. W.S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 4.

²⁶⁹ Marduk continues to take on divine characteristics of various gods. In one prayer “Sin is your divinity Anu your sovereignty/Dagan is your lordship, Enlil your kingship. . .” The poem continues to ascribe to Marduk features of the most important gods; Jean Bottéro, *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia* (trans. T. L. Fagan; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 57.

²⁷⁰ Lambert, “Mesopotamian Creation Stories,” 20.

Resonance in the *Enūma eliš*

According to the insights of CT outlined in chapter 3, one must first understand the expression being studied in the source culture, before examining its translation to the target culture. To avoid misunderstanding in the act of translation, one must not exaggerate how much resonance the expression had for the source culture. Thus, how significant was Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma eliš* for the Babylonians (resonance)? Is its distribution wide enough to have been available to Israelite scribes? One objection is to suppose that the *Enūma eliš*, being the creation of a single scribe (discussed below), was limited to a small circle of elites and had little impact either for the way in which the Babylonians or for other peoples such as the Israelites, expressed notions of divinity.

That Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma eliš* had significant influence is evident in the various stages and types of literary-cultic interaction with it. So many copies and responses to the *Enūma eliš* exist that its influence (at least in Babylon and Assyria) cannot be underestimated. Notably, we can consider the Assyrian recension of the *Enūma eliš*. The Babylonians' enemy, and sometimes ally to the north, the Assyrians were so impressed with Marduk's divinity that they expressed their own divinity according to the *Enūma eliš*. Likely attracted to the rise of Marduk, the ancient traditions Marduk was able to subsume, and the universalism of his kingship, the Assyrians copied the *Enūma eliš* in its entirety.²⁷¹ The Assyrians adopted the *Enūma eliš* with only minor changes.²⁷²

²⁷¹ Assyrian interest in Marduk is evident early on, at least on a personal level. The Assyrian king Aššur-uballit (1365-1330 BCE) had a scribe who, not only bears the theophoric element Marduk in his own name, but who also speaks of a temple of Marduk in the capital of Assyria. "276. The house which I erected in the shadow of the temple of the god Marduk, my lord. . .277. May the god Marduk, my lord, look upon that house and reward me for my labors. May he allow it to endure for the future of my sons..."; Albert K. Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Part I: From the Beginning to Ashur-reshai-ishi I* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1972), 42-43. Also see BM 96947; E. A. W. Budge and L. W.

They changed Marduk to the god Aššur, the Assyrian patron deity of the city by the same name, and changed the name of the city from Babylon to Baltil, to correspond to the religious centre of Assyria.²⁷³ Beyond the many intricacies, reasons for the changes, and the possible contradictions they caused and their desired effects, it is significant that a neighboring military power was so taken with the expression of divinity in the *Enūma eliš* that it adopted it as its own.²⁷⁴ Marduk's kingship was unique, had wide distribution and thus its resonance for the Babylonians and their Assyrian neighbors was substantial.

Wide distribution is also evident in the multiple copies of, and references to, the *Enūma eliš* throughout history up until later periods (600-100 BCE).²⁷⁵ Some of these copies show the *Enūma eliš* being recited before the Marduk statue in the Late Babylonian (LB) period during the *Akitu* festival. Given this festival's likely roots as an agricultural celebration, and its long attestation, the knowledge of the *Enūma eliš* must have been substantial thanks to its public reading at the festival. Thus the *Enūma eliš* had

King, *The Annals of the Kings of Assyria* (Londres: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1902), 388-391; Daniel D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926), 62ff.

²⁷² A lecture by Lambert covers the Assyrian recensions; Wilfred G. Lambert, "The Assyrian Recension of the *Enuma Elish*," in *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIXe Rencontre assyriologique internationale. Heidelberg, 6.-10. Juli 1992* (ed. H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann; Heidelberg: Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient 6, 1997), 77-79. For an updated version of Lambert's comments and a critique, arguing the Assyrians were much more careful in their changes, see Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 3-33.

²⁷³ Assyrian versions of the *Enūma eliš* are often dated to the reign of Sennacherib (704-681 BCE). Despite the lack of a date formula, expressions of divinity in the *Enūma eliš* that also reproduce images of Sennacherib's Akitu house are found in K 1356. Thus there is influence of the *Enūma eliš* even on neighboring architecture of the 7th century; Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 24, n. 24 addresses these details.

²⁷⁴ Assyrian scribes attempted to correspond An-šár in the *Enūma eliš* with Aššur. Maul explains the recognition of Aššur in An-šár by exploiting the Akkadian feature of syllable endings taking on the sound of first letter of the following syllable, in this case *n* > š; Maul, "The Ancient Middle Eastern Capital City," 13.

²⁷⁵ For a recent list of copies used to reconstruct the *Enūma eliš*, see Philippe Talon, *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth: Enūma Eliš* (SAACT 4; Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2005), xiii-xviii.

wide distribution and multiple cultural-cultic interactions further disseminating the myth.²⁷⁶ In addition to wide distribution and attestation over time, a later tradition attached to the poem was also widely known. The 50 names of Marduk demonstrate the elevation of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš* by assigning hypothetical etymologies to different theological names of Marduk, for the purpose of gathering into Marduk qualities from other deities. Three versions of this list were found in Assurbanipal's libraries at Nineveh.²⁷⁷

Finally, subsequent literary traditions indicate that the ideas in the *Enūma eliš* needed a response when new situations arose. The Erra poem is one of the possible theological responses to the *Enūma eliš*.²⁷⁸ At a time of crisis for Babylon, the Erra poem wrestles with the idealistic vision of Marduk presented in the *Enūma eliš* and attempts a revision.²⁷⁹ The Erra poem, using the temple abandonment genre, explains how Marduk was convinced to leave his Esagil in Babylon.²⁸⁰ There is some debate whether the Erra poem knew about the *Enūma eliš* or not since specific linguistic connections are lacking. Whether or not it was specifically responding to the *Enūma eliš*, it interacts with the views of Marduk to which the *Enūma eliš* first gave expression. While the date of the Erra poem is disputed, it is generally agreed that it was responding to the elevated vision

²⁷⁶ The recitation of the *Enūma eliš* at this significant cultic festival is discussed by G. Cagiran and W. G. Lambert, "The Late Babylonian Kislimu Ritual for Esagil," *JCS* 43-45 (1991-1993): 89-106. As Marduk decreed the fates for the coming year (based on his victory in the *Enūma eliš*), on the fourth day the priests would recite the myth of Marduk's victory. This was followed by the reenacting of the myth in the *kuppuru* ritual, which would dispel demonic forces from the temple as Marduk had done in his victory over Tiamat and her demons. For a text of the Marduk rite, see Linssen, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon*, 215-37. For discussion, see Wilfred G. Lambert, "Conflict in the Akitu House," *Iraq* 25 (1963): 189-90.

²⁷⁷ Andrea Seri, "The Fifty Names of Marduk in *Enūma Eliš*," *JAOS* 126 (2006): 507-19.

²⁷⁸ For discussion, see Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 6-9.

²⁷⁹ For discussion, see Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 6.

²⁸⁰ Various dates have been suggested for the Erra poem from the 12th century to the reign of Sennacherib (704-681 B.C.E.); Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 6.

of Marduk that did not seem to fit the current Babylonian situation.²⁸¹ Given the influence of the *Enūma eliš* and that it contained a unique expression of divinity, we can now turn to the issue of what motivated that expression.

The Problem of Dating and Motivations for Marduk's New Expression

Characterizing the motivating factors for Marduk's elevation in the *Enūma eliš* is tied to identifying a suitable historical context. The prospective dates of the *Enūma eliš* range from the OB period to the first millennium. A helpful starting point is the general agreement that the epic was written by one scribe; it was not written by a school of scribes and was not redacted over time and added to diachronically.²⁸² While there are clear indications of different traditions used in the *Enūma eliš*, the way those sources are woven together give the impression of a single scribe.²⁸³ The linguistic and thematic consistency throughout the poem is one major indication of a single scribe. Also, we could consider comparing the *Enūma eliš* to the Gilgamesh Epic. We know that the Gilgamesh epic was not only the result of various traditions, but the textual record is diverse enough to show that the epic was adopted and adapted in significant ways. There was likely an oral tradition from which came, not one version of the story, but a variety of versions, each with significant differences. We know of Sumerian, Old Babylonian and Standard Babylon versions of the Gilgamesh story.²⁸⁴ These factors indicate that multiple authors added to and changed the story of Gilgamesh in various time periods. By contrast, the versions of the *Enūma eliš* span 700 years, with remarkable consistency.

²⁸¹ Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations," 6.

²⁸² Most recently, see Lambert, "Mesopotamian Creation Stories," 17.

²⁸³ Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," 55-60.

²⁸⁴ Jeffery H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2002).

There are virtually no major variations in the manuscript tradition. Even when it is taken over in the Assyrian form, Aššur's name merely replaces Marduk's. This suggests the *Enūma eliš* already had a "canonical" form and resisted adaptation. A recent edition of the *Enūma eliš* notes changes in the manuscripts and these are rarely significant.²⁸⁵ All these factors considered, the *Enūma eliš* was written by one scribe who produced one version that did not change over its transmission history. Finally, the superscription may give some additional clues to single authorship. After the fifty names of Marduk, the poem's superscription contextualizes those names as a revelation by "the first one." This person is referred to twice. First, the revelation is given to this individual for the wise to ponder, the teacher to pass on to the student, and even for shepherds to contemplate (VII 145-162). After a summary of Marduk's kingship and power, the text indicates that this knowledge of Marduk, and implicitly the whole poem is: *tak-lim-ti maḥ-ru-ú id-bu-bu pa-nu-uš-šu*, "The revelation that the 'first one' spoke before him" (VII 157). If the "first-one" is the scribe who first revealed this expression of Marduk to people, such a reference, in combination with a consistency of theme, minor changes in the manuscript tradition and a consistent use of language also indicates a single scribe. Others have noted the unique diction of the single *Enūma eliš* poet.²⁸⁶ The narrative progression in the poem is the creation of one individual at one period of time. Thus, the whole poem advances Marduk's divinity as an absolute, universal king since one scribe has formulated all the

²⁸⁵ Talon, *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth*.

²⁸⁶ Benno Landsberger and J.V. Kinner Wilson, "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Elish," *JNES* 20 (1961): 154 note 2. For a discussion of the rarity in knowing authorship in ANE texts and some comments on the single authorship of the *Enūma eliš* in relation to other Mesopotamian works, see Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd ed. Maryland: CDL Press, 2005), 19-20.

aspects of the poem toward that end. This reality eliminates the need for further discussion of redaction or multiple authorships regarding the dating question.

Despite a debate among Assyriologists concerning the date of the *Enūma eliš*, all agree that it cannot be later than 800 BCE, which is the date of the earliest attested manuscript.²⁸⁷ Some like Dalley suggest an early date in the OB period (2000-1500 BCE).²⁸⁸ She challenges dating in relation to the Elamites' (from southwest Iran) stealing of Marduk's statue and the use of this event for dating the poem. In response to those, like Lambert, who argue the return of the statue would have occasioned the composition of the *Enūma eliš*, Dalley suggests that since theft—and return—of a statue occurred so often, using it to date the composition is suspect. Dalley envisions a redacted version of the *Enūma eliš* that incorporated many expressions and versions over time. One of the problems with this reconstruction is the assumption that various traditions in the *Enūma eliš* (Anzu and Etanna, Ninurta and Enlil) imply multiple redactions. Rather, the unique expression in the *Enūma eliš* is a logical extension of Marduk's increasing rise by a single scribe responding to specific and significant political, military and religious pressure.

That Dalley misunderstands how traditions are used in the poem is evident in her early dating based upon Marduk's status in the prologue to the Code of Hammurabi (CH). While Marduk was king in some capacity before the *Enūma eliš*, the expressions of kingship in the poem are more developed than its earlier forms. The CH prologue states

²⁸⁷ The earliest version of the *Enūma eliš*, KAR 317, is dated paleographically and that evidence is accepted by Lambert, "The Assyrian Recension of the Enuma Elish," 77 and Andrew R. George, "The Tower of Babel: Archaeology, History and Cuneiform Texts," *AfO* 51 (2005-06): 87, n. 15.

²⁸⁸ Stephanie Dalley, "Statues of Marduk and the Date of the *Enūma eliš*," *AF* 24 (1997): 163-71. Her views have found some support by M. Dietrich, "Das *Enūma eliš* als mythologischer Grundtext für die Identität der Marduk-Religion Babyloniens," *FAR* 40 (2006): 135-63.

that Anu and Enlil committed the rule of all mankind to Marduk.²⁸⁹ In particular Maul notes that the theologians of Hammurabi were already transferring characteristics of Enlil onto Marduk (CH I, 1-26).²⁹⁰ Yet in the CH Marduk is not given power over the gods, only power over humanity. Marduk's elevation has not yet reached the breadth and height of kingship envisioned in the *Enūma eliš*. Also, in the prologue of CH, Enlil remains a separate deity from Marduk. Enlil and Anu give the power to Marduk whereas by the time of the *Enūma eliš*, Marduk adopts the god Enlil and the implications of his divinity.²⁹¹ In the CH the other gods retain their positions of power. Anu is *Anum šīrum šar Anunnakī*, “the exalted one, prince of the Anunaki” and Enlil is *Enlil bēl šamê u eršetim ša'im šīmāt*, “Enlil, lord of heaven and earth, [the one who] determines fates”. These titles are later used for Marduk in the *Enūma eliš*. For example, Marduk is the determiner of fates in II 161 and III 62, 120. Yet during Hammurabi's reign, those titles had not yet been transferred to Marduk. Indeed the process had begun, but during the 18th century the full vision of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš* is not evident. While the CH shows that Nippur is no longer the cultic centre and Marduk is on the rise, the *Enūma eliš* cannot be dated to this period. The situation of Marduk in the CH is similar to YHWH

²⁸⁹ *Inu Anum šīrum šar Anunnakī Enlil bēl šamê u eršetim ša'im šīmāt mātim ana Marduk mārīm rēšfīm ša Ea illilūt kiššat nišī išīmušum in Igigi ušarbiušu Bābilam šumšu šīram ibbiu in kibrātim ušāterušu in libbišu šarrūtām dārītām ša kīma šamê u eršetim išdāša šuršudā ukinnušum*. “When Anum, the exalted one, prince of the Anunnaki, and Enlil, lord of heaven and earth, [the one who] determines fates of the country, decreed to Marduk, the first-born of Ea, power over all the peoples, raised him with the Igigi, named Babylon as an exalted name and made it supreme in the land and, and set up within it and eternal kingship, which like heaven and earth is fixed”. For a different translation, see Martha T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (SBLWAW 6; 2nd ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press; 1997). Another discussion and translation is available in M. E. J. Richardson, *A Comprehensive Grammar to Hammurabi's Stele* (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2008).

²⁹⁰ Maul, “The Ancient Middle Eastern Capital City,” 11. In the superscription of the *Enūma eliš* Marduk is called the “Enlil of the gods” (VII 149).

²⁹¹ Under the influence of *Lugal-e* and *Anzû*, Marduk assumes the roles of the two main deities of Nippur, Enlil the king and Ninurta, the warrior son of Enlil.

being given power from El to rule over the tribe of Judah in Deut 32:8-9. In the OB period as represented by the CH, Marduk is not yet expressed as the universal creator and warrior king in charge of the gods.

Lambert's Dating

Lambert's date for the *Enūma eliš* remains the most widely accepted. His study, conducted in 1964, argues Marduk gained status among the gods during the reign of Hammurabi in the 18th century, but ascended as the head god during the 12th century under the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I. Further studies have reinforced a Kassite-period rise of Marduk, but have not specified Lambert's date under the rise of Nebuchadnezzar I.²⁹² Lambert documents the rise of Marduk and the shifting focus on cities, from Eridu and Sippar in Sumerian tradition, to Babylon, as evident in the Kurigalzu inscription and the Weidner Chronicle.²⁹³ Attentive to this development, Lambert dates the poem to 1125-1104 BCE during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I, the native Babylonian king during the Second Dynasty of Isin.²⁹⁴ Lambert's proposed date is a time of peace for Babylon in which the Elamites had captured the statue of Marduk, returned it, and Babylonian rule was restored. He proposes it was written just before or shortly after the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I "as a manifesto of the theological revolution which demoted the old

²⁹² Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I," 3-13. Sommerfeld agrees with the final rise of Marduk during the later 12 century but prefers to maintain a Kassite date for the rise of Marduk. Lambert's position is more detailed; von Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks*, 174-81.

²⁹³ The former inscription reads, on the recto, Babylon as "the eternal city"; see Alfred Boissier, "Document Cassite," *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'Archéologie Orientale* 39 (1932): 93-104.

²⁹⁴ Sommerfeld has preferred to see the rise of Marduk to eternal kingship in the MB period (1595–1000 B.C.E). In a review of Sommerfeld's work, Lambert has pointed out, that while there are personal names that reflect the idea of Marduk as king in the MB period like: "Marduk is king of the gods"; Wilfred G. Lambert, "Studies in Marduk," *BSOAS* 1 (1984): 1-9 notes that Sommerfeld does not include the more frequently occurring personal names of the same period that refer to the other gods (Nabu, Ninurta, Ea, Sin) in the same way. Therefore, referring to a deity as king of the gods did not necessitate the reality of that expression. One had to also remove the power of the other gods. Further, the Kassite dating of the *Enūma eliš* is challenged by Lambert; Lambert, "Studies in Marduk," 5-6.

Sumerian Enlil to make way for Marduk”.²⁹⁵ For most scholars this historical context remains the preferred date.²⁹⁶ While this study has no reason to disagree with Lambert’s date, it proposes a slight shift of question by utilizing the insights of CT to ask what motivated Marduk’s unique expression of divinity? Answering this need not shift the date of composition of the poem, but it may shift the motivations for why Marduk was expressed in a new way.

Although Lambert sets the motivation for the *Enūma eliš* during a time of peace and celebration of a returned statue, he realizes the need for a more intense and negative motivating factor behind the composition. His solution is setting such motivation in the Babylonian experience of Kassite rule. Lambert constructs a hypothetical situation in which the Kassite kings who took over Babylon motivated a response by the Babylonian priests of Marduk. For Lambert, Kassite rule “had witnessed an example of religious imperialism quite foreign to the tolerance of Sumerian city states”.²⁹⁷ Lambert admits our disparate knowledge about Kassite rule and notes they largely left the Babylonian religious system in place. Yet in seeking a motivation for Marduk’s final elevation, Lambert emphasizes the personal deities of the Kassite kings as a possible threat to the Babylonians.²⁹⁸ Using one Kassite inscription, Lambert speculates: “[s]uch a situation, even if its influence was not felt outside the narrow court circle, could well have sown ideas in the minds of the priests of Marduk . . . Their own god could with much better claim head the pantheon . . . When the Cassites and their gods were finally driven out, the

²⁹⁵ Lambert, “Mesopotamian Creation Stories,” 18.

²⁹⁶ Frahm, “Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations,” 4-6.

²⁹⁷ Lambert, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I,” 7.

²⁹⁸ The deities Šuqamuna and Šumaliya were divine patrons of the royal Kassite house and perhaps family gods; Alfred Boissier, “Document Cassite,” 93; Lambert, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I,” 8.

priests of Marduk could now set in motion any plan to elevate their patron deity within the pantheon.”²⁹⁹ After the Hittites defeated Babylon, the Elamites took away the statue of Marduk; only after Nebuchadnezzar I brought back the statue, a Babylonian period of peace came. For Lambert this period was an opportunity to express Marduk as absolute king in response to Kassite period imperialism that motivated the final elevation of Marduk, officially expressed by the *Enūma eliš* in 1125-1104 BCE during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I.³⁰⁰

All subsequent theories must take seriously Lambert’s evidence and its detailed support by Sommerfeld. This chapter does not dispute this date and is more concerned with what political, military and religious context motivated the unique expression of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš*. While we have indications from personal names and god-lists of Marduk’s elevation, it is the final expression of Marduk’s kingship in mythical form that is the most striking.

Abusch draws attention to the type of pressure expected, yet argues for a date in the first two centuries of the first millennium.³⁰¹ For Abusch the *Enūma eliš* was

²⁹⁹ Lambert, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I,” 8-9. Lambert seems to soften this position in a review article. While he does not directly address his earlier comments on Kassite pressure, Lambert characterizes the Kassite kings as having their political station in Babylon and was, at least politically, the king’s god; Lambert, “Studies in Marduk,” 5.

³⁰⁰ The references to Marduk in personal names, or his ranking among the gods, do not solve this problem. By the Kassite period, Marduk was a second-tier god with Anu, Enlil and Ea as the first tier; Lambert, “Studies in Marduk,” 3. The organization of this group and their reaction to Kassite rule as constructed by Lambert is speculative. No texts have been discovered that show the priests of Marduk reaction to Kassite rule. Yet it is helpful to think of some group motivating the change that eventually came to be expressed in the Babylonian epic poem. Thus, we maintain Lambert’s “priests of Marduk” as a hypothetical group.

³⁰¹ Abusch, “Marduk,” *DDD* 547-48. Abusch assumes two conditions had to be met before Marduk could be elevated as king. First, Babylon had to replace Nippur. Second, a new model of world organization had to be evident. Concerning the latter criteria, it is equally possible that the expression could have been developed to instill new ideas and progress them. This seems possible since we have earlier expressions of Marduk as creator god (cylinder seals already discussed). In examples of Marduk prior to the *Enūma eliš*, many of the elements of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš* were in place, but seem to have been

composed “when it was necessary to preserve the memory of Babylon’s ascendancy . . . it was composed some time during the early first millennium [1000 BCE?] in a period of weakness. . . and served to bolster the city’s claim to cultural prestige and privilege at a time when it was coping with the loss of political power and centrality”.³⁰² The reading lens of CT calls attention to the political and religious conditions in which Lambert and Abusch construct the rise of Marduk.³⁰³ Yet if the priests of Marduk needed to elevate their patron deity instead of the Kassite household gods Šuqamuna and Šimaliya, all that was needed was to elevate Marduk to head of the divine council. This would have been a more logical and less drastic change that would have achieved their aims. To supplant Enlil would have been radical enough, yet Marduk’s kingship does much more than this in the *Enūma eliš*.³⁰⁴

Kassite Rule and Lambert’s Date of the *Enūma eliš*

Lambert suggests that Kassite presence was the external pressure and motivation for the rise in Marduk’s divinity, yet the Kassites do not fit the profile for being a strong external pressure to motivate the changes in Marduk’s kingship.³⁰⁵ While the writing of the *Enūma eliš* may have taken place during 1125-1104 BCE, as Lambert argues, there were pressures greater than Kassite presence that motivated change to Marduk’s divinity.

After the reign of Hammurabi in 1750 BCE, the Kassites likely migrated from

used on a personal level rather than a national level. Rather a significant motivation was needed to bring those expressions together in a mythological text and thus to a national level.

³⁰² Abusch, “Marduk,” *DDD* 547.

³⁰³ Dating issues aside, the insights from CT, Lambert, Abusch and Frahm (partly) all coincide on the type of conditions in which the *Enūma eliš* was likely composed. Frahm analyzes the Erra epic, the Assyrian recession of the *Enūma eliš* and others as counter-texts or texts of response. The methodology of CT applies a similar logic and is a more concerted effort to explore motivations for composition.

³⁰⁴ The equation of Enlil and Marduk, outside the *Enūma eliš* occurs in an inscription of king Simbar-Shipak (1025-1008 BCE); Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “Mesopotamia” in *Ancient Religions* (ed. S. I. Johnston; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 169.

³⁰⁵ Lambert, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I,” 3-13.

Kurdistan to take over Babylon and ruled until 1156 BCE. Since the Kassite reign over Babylon covered a significant amount of time (about 400 years),³⁰⁶ there must have been some acceptance of this situation by the Babylonian inhabitants. Sustained rules often come with great advantages for the majority of citizens, like Ottoman rule which allowed great freedom of movement throughout the Near East and Roman rule which offered infrastructure, lower taxes, and city building.³⁰⁷ The same is true of Kassite rule. Kassite rule adopted Babylonian institutions and largely blended into the Babylonian system of religion. While we have a minor indication that they retained some private worship of their own gods, we also know they adopted the worship of Enlil perhaps in an attempt to unite Babylon by appealing to the Babylonians' Sumerian heritage. From the perspective of this side of history, there was no threat of adopting Kassite religion or submitting to Kassite gods. All factors indicate that Kassite rule was a period of peace and prosperity for Babylon as well as for other ethnic groups that resided there.³⁰⁸ Indeed, the Kassites are difficult to identify since they adopted, let flourish and even promoted Babylonian institutions and customs.

The evidence of Kassite support for Babylonian literature and culture includes a flourishing of Babylonian professions during this time. The el-Amarna letters attest to an

³⁰⁶ The Babylonian King List A (BM 33332) records 36 kings of the Kassite dynasty; John Brinkman, *A Catalogue of Cuneiform Source Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty* (Materials and Studies For Kassite History Vol. 1; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1976), 424-39.

³⁰⁷ This observation, by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor o.p., comes from one of many fine conversations I enjoyed with him over meals at the École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem in 2010.

³⁰⁸ The organized central administration during the Kassite period, and the use of gold instead of silver as standard currency, attests to the wealth of the society; Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East* (Vol 1; London: Routledge 1994), 342-343.

elevated view of Babylonian culture during the Kassite period.³⁰⁹ Babylonian culture and professions were prized as far away as Egypt and were certainly held in high esteem by Babylon's neighbors. In a text written in the Kassite period, during the seven years when the Assyrians occupied Babylon, the Assyrian king Tukulti-Ninurta I boasts of the spoils he takes from there. While gold is among them, the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta goes into considerable detail about the literary products of Babylonian culture that are prized finds.³¹⁰ Among the treasures listed are scribal texts, divination texts, medical texts and inventory lists of past kings of Babylon. In typical Assyrian expression these treasures filled boats to be taken back to Assyria. The Assyrians, even after defeating Kassite Babylon, prized Kassite-Babylonian culture and offered it before their gods.

This picture of Kassite rule is less likely a period that would motivate a significant change in the expression of Marduk's divinity. Rather, the Kassite period allowed for, and encouraged, the expression of Marduk. First, we know that one-third of seal inscriptions during the Kassite period were addressed to Marduk.³¹¹ While this must be balanced with the reality that we do not have all Kassite seals, it shows there was openness to the expression of Marduk.³¹² We know Kassite rulers promoted traditional Babylonian cults by installing members of the royal family in Babylonian cultic offices.³¹³ Under such rule, Babylonian scribes produced lengthy literary poems like *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi*, which praise Marduk as a personal saviour. In it Marduk is clearly on

³⁰⁹ For example see EA 10, which show skilled craftsmen. For an overview of Kassite positive contributions, see Bill T. Arnold, *Who Were the Babylonians?* (SBLABS 10; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 62-73. For the significance of the el-Amarna letters and their representations of Babylon during the Kassite period, see Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East*, 339.

³¹⁰ Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 64.

³¹¹ von Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks*, 157.

³¹² For a criticism of Sommerfeld's positive conclusions regarding Marduk's elevation based on the seal evidence, see Lambert, "Studies in Marduk," 6.

³¹³ J.A. Brinkman and D. Matthews, "A Grandson of Kurigalzu," *NABU* (1990): n. 103.

the rise, but as personal and national savior rather than as the absolute king of the *Enūma eliš*.³¹⁴ Therefore, the Kassite support for Babylonian religion, culture and professions, provided an environment in which Babylonian scribes could freely develop Marduk theology. In that freedom there was no reason for Marduk to be elevated the way he was in the *Enūma eliš*.³¹⁵ There is a more suitable context in which to envision Marduk's elevation in the Babylonian epic.

Tukulti-Ninurta I conquered Babylon in 1215 BC, and ruled for seven years; a more immanent threat was this early form of Assyrian imperialism.³¹⁶ Although Lambert constructs a hypothetical situation of oppressive Kassite power, from what we know Assyria was always the greater threat to Babylon. Under Assyrian rule Babylon became a vassal state. This alternative period follows Lambert's inclination for a period of intense occupation, accepts aspects of Lambert's dating to after the OB period (1500 BCE) but before 1000 BCE, and attends to the insights of CT that contextualize new cultural expressions within political and military pressures.

³¹⁴ Annus and Lenzi, *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi: The Standard Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*.

³¹⁵ Marduk may have been elevated during the Kassite period. In the god list An=Anum, in which each god is associated with a number, Marduk is given the number 50. This number was traditionally reserved for Enlil and associating it with Marduk suggests Marduk's taking of Enlil's position. For a discussion of this text and the difficulties in dating it, see Lambert, "Studies in Marduk," 3.

³¹⁶ In the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta, Assyrian accounts of war demonstrate the roots of a universalistic perspective, which later become common types of Assyrian propaganda in texts like the Sennacherib prism. For a discussion of the historical context of the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta and how it functions as a precursor to later Assyrian imperialism, see Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 516-517. In the epic itself see A 18', Ibid., 116. Machinist gathers together the fragments of texts and refers to them as text A (BM 121033), B (BM 98730) and C (BM 978731) that are the most fully preserved texts. Thus "IB" refers to column I from text B. An explanation of their corresponding publications is in Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 7. In this study, page references are given for the transliteration whereas Machinist's translation is on the following page.

The Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I and Assyrian Threats to Marduk

The reasons for the change to Marduk's divinity as presented in the *Enūma eliš*, are complex and can never be known with certainty. Yet some possibilities are more likely than others, and even a speculative hypothesis about why Marduk's divinity changed so dramatically is helpful to understand the type of pressures that may have motivated a change in divinity, later helping us understand a similar change in YHWH's divinity.

The relationship between Assyria and Babylon is complex and has a longer history than the relations between Babylon and the Kassites. The former is suitable to understand the type of military and religious pressures that motivated a radical expression of divinity. Babylon was always Assyria's elder (and more culturally advanced) neighbor, although Assyria was more militarily advanced.³¹⁷ This relationship manifested itself in a series of treaties, border disputes and sometimes the two sides united against a common enemy. Yet at two significant times in their history, a radical departure from the normative situation took place when Assyria occupied the capital of Babylon. This occurred first during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208 BCE)³¹⁸ and would not happen again until 744 BCE, after our earliest version of the *Enūma eliš*.³¹⁹ Thus, the

³¹⁷ Peter Machinist, "The Assyrians and their Babylonian Problem: Some Reflections," *Wissenschaftskollegs zu Berlin Jahrbuch* (1984/85): 354-64. Generally, Babylon was militarily dominant over Assyria until the 14th century, when a shift occurred under the Assyrian king Aššur-uballit.

³¹⁸ For an alternative chronology (1240-1205 BCE), see Yigal Bloch, "The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I," *Orientalia* 79 (2010): 1-35.

³¹⁹ A century after Tukulti-Ninurta I Babylon was occupied again under Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076 B.C.E). Yet Tiglath-pileser's success was more prevalent in the north than in Babylon to the south. He was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar I (1126-1105 BCE) and later, Ashur-bel-kala (1073-1056) made a treaty with Babylon through marriage; see Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East*, 358-61. If one wanted to make a sustained argument for the origins of the *Enūma eliš* under Tiglath-Pileser I, this would not change the thrust of the current argument that the Babylonian change to Marduk's divinity was likely in response to Assyrian rule. For an overview of Tiglath-Pileser I and his military campaigns, see J. Nicholas Postgate, "Review of Khaled Nashef, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittelassyrischen*

most relevant time period in which the greatest threat to Babylonian cultural and religious expression occurred is merely one-hundred years before Lambert's suggested date of the *Enūma eliš*.

The period of peace in which Lambert sets the *Enūma eliš* (1125-1104 BCE) is not that distant from the period of Assyrian occupation (1233-1197 BCE).³²⁰ Tukulti-Ninurta conquered Babylon in 1215 BCE, defeating Kaštiliaš IV, and was killed by his son in 1197 BCE.³²¹ Allowing that the latest date of composition suggested by Lambert was the end of Nebuchadnezzar I's reign (1104 BCE) and that the realization of Assyrian presence was in 1215 BCE, there is only a gap of 111 years. Yet the implications for what the *Enūma eliš* is responding to are vastly different whether one sets that response against a Kassite or an Assyrian presence.

Various sources narrate the Assyrian position and demonstrate Assyria as a greater threat than Kassite rule. The common view is that Tukulti-Ninurta directed two campaigns against Babylon, the first allowing the capture of Kaštiliaš IV, the second resulting in the conquest of the city of Babylon.³²² According to Yamanda, after the capture of the Babylonian king, the Assyrians were then able to capture Babylon by

Zeit (RGTC 5)," *Afo* 32 (1985): 95-101. For his specific relationship with Babylon, see Albert K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (TCS 5, Locust, 1975), 164-65.

³²⁰ We know the date of Tukulti-Ninurta from economic texts see, J. A. Brinkman, *Materials and Studies for Kassite History I: A Catalogue of Cuneiform Sources* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1976), 313, 386 and Pl 7 no. 13.

³²¹ See the discussion in Hannes D. Galter, "Looking Down the Tigris: The Interrelations Between Assyria and Babylonia," in *The Babylonian World* (ed. Gwendolyn Leick; New York: Routledge, 2007), 530.

³²² This is based on the following inscription found in Aššur: "This corn is given out for the rations of the Kassite people, plunder of the land of Karduniaš, from the [2 *ḫar-ra-na-te*] two campaigns"; J. N. Postgate, *The Archive of Urad-Šerūa and His Family: A Middle Assyrian Household in Government Service*. (Roma: Roberto Denicola Editore, 1988), No. 52.

proxy.³²³ The last three Babylonian kings ruled as proxies of Tukulti-Ninurta I. After removing the proxy king Adad-šuma-iddina, he then ruled Babylon directly. While sources regarding the Assyrian presence in Babylon are more often used for organizing the particulars of chronology, they also illuminate Babylonian perspectives toward the Assyrian threat.

The Assyrian relationship with Babylon went to the very heart of cultural and religious identity. Babylon posed for Assyria deep questions of identity and thus Assyria was always attracted to Babylon. Yamada notes that the Babylonian King List A omits this period of Assyrian rule to erase it from their memory. He also points out that Chronicle P, another Babylonian source, despises Tukulti-Ninurta.³²⁴ Assyrian interest in military control of Babylon was also combined with their theological interest in Marduk. Just before the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta, the Assyrian king Aššur-uballit's (1365-1330 BCE) scribe bears the name Marduk-nadin-aḫḫe. This Assyrian scribe also builds his house in the shadow of Marduk's temple.

276. The house which I erected in the shadow of the temple of the god Marduk, my lord . . . 277. May the god Marduk, my lord, look upon that house and reward me for my labours. May he allow it to endure for the future of my sons...³²⁵

It is significant that a senior Assyrian scribe bears the name of Marduk and speaks of Marduk's cult in Assyria. The Assyrian interest in Marduk, combined with early forms of

³²³ Shigeo Yamada, "Tukulti-Ninurta I's Rule over Babylonia and its Aftermath," *Orient* 38 (2003): 153-77.

³²⁴ Yamada, "Tukulti-Ninurta I's Rule over Babylonia and its Aftermath," 153-77.

³²⁵ Grayson, *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Vol I*, 42-43; BM 96947.

Assyrian imperialism in the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta, deserve consideration as a possible motivation for the *Enūma eliš*.³²⁶

Furthermore, we can consider the role of competing cities during this time opposed to times of cooperation between Assyria and Babylon. Lambert has noted the fall and rise of particular cities in the rise of Marduk. Given the importance of Marduk's relationship to the city of Babylon, it is logical that the response to elevate Marduk in a radical way would take place when the central Babylonian city was most threatened. It is evident the Assyrians wanted complete rule and not just an expansion of territory. The Assyrians specifically focused on capturing the Babylonian king. Tukulti-Ninurta I was keen to conquer Babylon and its king, communicating his goal to those under him. The Assyrian king chastises his grand vizier (the SUKKAL.GAL/ sukkallū rabi'u) Aššur-iddin for failing to capture the Babylonian king when needed.

. . . and you do nothing! You think in your heart "They humiliate him, how much they humiliate him! Would that the whole land of Karduniash were decorated (?) (richly) as a dining-table" (Yet,) a person (caring) about his own rescue does not care about being humiliated. (Now,) I am glad: the army will not reach the trading post/harbor. They have brought it up for him but they will hand it over to me.³²⁷

While the text is fragmentary, it seems the grand vizier of Tukulti-Ninurta I disagrees with the plan to capture the king. Here and in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I the breadth of Assyrian expansionistic desire is evident.

³²⁶ The Epic itself, besides being rooted in MA tradition, also reflects the influence of MB poetry, in which we have the occurrence of SB, the same dialect of the *Enūma eliš*; Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 509-14.

³²⁷ Translation by Bloch, "The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 11. Yigal's translation is based on the transcription in E. C. Cancik-Kirschbaum, *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šeḥ Ḥamad* (Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šeḥ Ḥamad/Dür Katlimmu 4; Berlin; 1996) no. 9, 38-46.

A final reason the Assyrian threat is a more likely context for the final elevation of Marduk is evident in the Assyrian rhetoric. In a speech to the Babylonian king, there is a direct challenge of the Assyrian mentality to its Babylonian neighbor: “Why is your army always fleeing Kaštiliaš? When are you going to fight Kaštiliaš? I have conquered and plundered your land. I know your insolence and angry desire for battle. Your vaunted refuge will soon not be safe . . .”³²⁸ The extent to which Tukulti-Ninurta wanted to possess Babylon is also evident in one of his royal inscriptions. After narrating a defeat and capture of Kaštiliaš, Tukulti-Ninurta I claims the boundaries of his rule: “I became lord of Sumer and Akkad in its entirety (and) fixed the boundary of my land as the Lower Sea in the east”.³²⁹ If Babylonian awareness of Assyrian desires was close to what we now know, a strong Babylonian response was expected.

The *Enūma eliš* and The Epic of Tukulti Ninurta

Various connections between the Assyrian epic and Babylonian *Enūma eliš* suggest the Babylonian response was to Assyrian pressure. The Babylonian poem was not necessarily responding to the Assyrian one, and such a case need not be demonstrated. Rather, correspondences of expression between the two poems demonstrates that the *Enūma eliš* is responding to the general tone of Assyrian policy, part of which is represented in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta.

A foundational dissertation by Machinist remains the primary study for understanding this epic. His dissertation is not only a critical edition of the text, but also a commentary on the place of the epic in the Assyrian cultural landscape. Machinist does

³²⁸ 13’-24’ IVA, Machinist, “The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I,” 306.

³²⁹ RIMA 1, A.0.78.5, 56-60.

not consider the question of Marduk's Babylonian expression during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta (since that is not his focus), but defines the relationship between Babylon and Assyria during this time as a *Kulturkampf* (cultural war).³³⁰ From the Assyrian view, the purpose of Tukulti-Ninurta's reign was clear: to make Assyria the new cultural centre of Mesopotamia and begin an expansion of the Assyrian empire.

To accomplish this, Assyria removes Marduk from his cultural centre in Babylon by using the genre of temple abandonment. Similar to city laments that explain catastrophic events, the Assyrian's have Marduk abandon Babylon.³³¹ Casting the Kassite leader of Babylon as the treaty breaker and Tukulti-Ninurta as the treaty upholder emphasizes the reason for the abandonment and is the first step in removing Marduk from his Babylonian context.³³²

After Marduk abandons Babylon, Aššur rises to replace Marduk. Yet there is increased reference to Aššur in the context of war and specific reference to the "weapon of Aššur". At first, reference to Aššur is balanced since Aššur appears among Enlil, Adad, and Ninurta.³³³ Then upon the defeat of the Kassite king, the other gods become referred to in a more generalized sense ("Igigi-gods") while Aššur stands prominently. This generalized reference to the gods versus the naming of Aššur, elevates the latter in contrast with his place among the gods at the start of the epic. A few lines after Tukulti-Ninurta offers sacrifice to the Igigi-gods, Aššur is now referred to as the "Assyrian

³³⁰ Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 522.

³³¹ IB 32'-47'; Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 64-65. Marduk's (here AMAR.UTU's) abandonment is in IB 38'; Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 64.

³³² Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 41. Also its classification of sin: A 32'-33'; Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 72.

³³³ Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 118.

Enlil”.³³⁴ This title is particularly directed at Babylon since Marduk takes on the characteristics of Enlil in Babylonian tradition. Thus the Assyrians are laying claim to their shared Sumerian heritage with the Babylonians by ascribing to their deity, and thus their capital, the characteristics of the Sumerian religious capital of Nippur under Enlil.

In the *Enūma eliš* there is a similar narrative progression in response to early imperialism in Assyria. At the start of the poem, the number of gods introduced is substantial. In the first twenty lines of Tablet I, eight deities are introduced. The first half of the poem generally represents the typical ANE vision of a polytheistic context, each deity with different spheres of authority, continued with the myriad of entities under the command of Tiamat. By Tablet III the focus is only on Marduk and Tiamat/Kingu, while the other gods are now characterized in general terms as the Igigi gods (III 126). Despite the brief reference to Anshar and Nudimmud in IV 125-126, the focus has shifted to Marduk. They proclaim Marduk’s kingship and by Tablet IV those gods are now unnamed. In both epics, Aššur and Marduk are elevated above the other gods in these competing versions.

Even though Aššur was a threat to the centrality of Marduk’s rule, the Assyrian epic offers a sharper challenge to Marduk’s authority and a more likely motivation for a Babylonian response. The rise of Aššur is foreshadowed by the representation of Tukulti-Ninurta in the Assyrian epic. In particular, the characteristics of Tukulti-Ninurta suggest the Assyrian king is trying to overtake the role of Marduk. As discussed already, the Babylonian rise of Marduk entailed both warrior–Ninurta traditions and head-god

³³⁴ Machinist, “The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I,” 130; the line reads: “(BE) *assuri*” line 20’.

traditions of Enlil to complete the rise of Marduk. This combination also exists in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta through the human king.³³⁵ IA 15'-18' states:

15' *u ki-ma* ^d*Nin-urta a-na ni-iš kakkē/ī* (^{giš}*TUKUL* ^{meš})-*šu*
ul-ta-nap-šá-qa ka-liš kibrātu (*UB* ^{meš})

18' *šu-ú-ma ša-lam* ^d*E/Ilil*(*BE*) *da-ru-ú še-e-mu pi-i*
nišē/ī (*UKU* ^{meš}) *mi-lik māte/i*(*KUR*)³³⁶

15' and when he brandishes his weapon like Ninurta
 all the regions of the earth everywhere hover in panic³³⁷

18' It is he who is the eternal image of Enlil, attentive to the people's voice, the council of the land.³³⁸

Tukulti-Ninurta is described as raising weapons like Ninurta and three lines later as the eternal image of Enlil. For a king to be expressed with characteristics of the gods is not uncommon; for the king to take on a combination of the warrior god Ninurta and the head god Enlil is notable. For this Akkadian king to take on these specific features just before a Babylonian text is also expressing Marduk in similar terms suggests that an exchange is occurring. The whole poem exists for the sole elevation of Marduk and the clarification of Marduk's eternal and universal kingship. Thus in response to the type of Assyrian imperialism preserved in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta, the Babylonian poem ascribes to

³³⁵ We assume the text is describing Tukulti-Ninurta since "the lord of all the lands designated him as head of all the soldiers;" Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 68. Later the epic states "no one among all the kings ever competed with him in war." Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 70.

³³⁶ Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 68.

³³⁷ Štn of *pašāqum*. Here the *š>l* before a dental is a sign of standard Babylonian phonology. Thus, this text of the Middle Assyrian period is written in Standard Babylonian. John Huehnergard, *A Grammar of Akkadian* (2nd ed.; HSS 45; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 596; CAD P III/3.

³³⁸ Foster, *Before the Muses*, 301-02. A more literal translation is: 15' and like Ninurta, at the raising of his weapons he will continually causes the whole earth to suffer 18' He himself is the eternal image of Enlil, hearing the voice of the people, the council of the land. For Machinist's translation, see Machinist, "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I," 69. "15' And when he raises his weapons like Ninurta, the regions (of the world) everywhere are thrown into constant panic. 18' He alone is the eternal image of Enlil, attentive to the voice of the people, to the counsel of the land."

Marduk the Enlil and Ninurta traditions in greater detail and with increased reference to its own literary-cultural traditions.³³⁹

The *Enūma eliš* also assigns to Marduk the role of Enlil, the divine king in Sumerian literature. He is expressed as father, king and creator in multiple texts and thus is head of the divine council, similar to El at Ugarit. In the *Enūma eliš* Marduk takes over Enlil's place by being given this kingship. This takes place in II. 115; II. 155 and is realized in IV. 25 and V. 85, with the acknowledgment of Marduk as king: *iḫ-du-ú ik-ru-bu*^d AMAR.UTU-ma LUGAL "They rejoiced, they blessed Marduk as king" (IV.25). Marduk is given authority over the gods that Enlil held. Later, in the fifty names of Marduk, his position as Enlil is even more pronounced (VII 135-136). Therefore, it is clear that both the Assyrian occupation of Babylon and the Assyrian rhetoric were a threat to Marduk.

The Assyrian epic continues to exhibit Assyrian expressions that would have motivated a Babylonian response. The epic seems to reference part of the Marduk–

³³⁹ Lambert has studied the borrowing of traditions and draws on the similarities between *Enūma eliš* and *Anzû*, arguing that the former was based on the later in order to recast Marduk as a new Ninurta. The plot lines of both are parallel; Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," 56. For example, *Anzû* is about loss and recovery of Tablet of Destinies and this parallels *Enūma eliš* I 157; IV 81-82 and 121; IV 122; V 69-70. In addition to the tablet of destinies, *Anzû* shares with the *Enūma eliš* themes of conflicts between gods and the use of special names for the victor of cosmic battle. Lambert also demonstrates that the eleven monstrous animals and enemies of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš* (I 133-146), parallel the number of monsters in the Sumerian sources for Ninurta's victory and corresponds to the number of monsters in the Ninurta texts; Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," 57.

The question of a literary text's direction of development can be argued in various ways. That the increased details supposes a later tradition, finds parallel in the development of *maqlû* texts against witchcraft. Abusch argues the standard text of *Maqlû* VII 111-140, is the later addition to an earlier, briefer Neo-Babylonian recension (K 5350+iii). The standard text adds various details about evil and the witch in order to give the *ašiptum* (a female exorcist) more power over the witch; Tzvi Abusch, "The *Maqlû* Ritual and the Growth of Incantations" (paper presented at Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations Department Seminars on the Ancient Near East, Toronto, Canada, 17th February, 2011). In a similar way, the increased details of Marduk's position in the *Enūma eliš* indicate a response to Assyrian expression of the human king.

Babylonian tradition and offer a counter-point to it. Just before the previously cited text that combines Enlil and Ninurta traditions into the Tukulti-Ninurta epic, the text describes Marduk as follows: *ša bēl mātāt/i* (EN KUR.KUR) ^d*e/illil* (BE)-*lu-su* “Enlilship of the lord of all the lands”.³⁴⁰ Thus the Assyrian epic draws attention to Marduk’s rising kingship in order to demonstrate how the Assyrian human king supplants Marduk’s Enlilship. The elevation of Marduk and Tukulti-Ninurta in their respective poems is a competition for position.³⁴¹

Finally, there is one more speculative possibility that the Babylonian poem may be characterizing the Assyrians and utilizing self-Assyrian description to formulate the enemies of Marduk. The Babylonian poem’s characterization of evil echoes the self-description of the Assyrian forces in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta. Consider Tiamat’s unrelenting power in the *Enūma eliš*, which none of the gods can combat, and its similarity to the absolute power of the Assyrian army in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta.

Tiamat is a supreme commander in charge of setting up the military:

ú-ša-aš-qa ^d*kin-gu ina bi-ri-šú* *ša-a-šu uš-rab-bi-iš*
a-li-ku-ut maḥ-ru pa-ni um-ma-ni mu-ir-ru-tum pu-úḥ-ru
na-še-e kak-ku ti-iš-bu-tum te-bu-ú a-na-an-tum
[šu]-ut ta-am-ḥa-ra ra-ab-sik-kát-ú-tum
[ip]-qid-a qa-tu-uš-šú ú-še-ši-ba-aš-ši ina kar-ri (II. 34-38).
 “She raised up Qingu from among them,
 it was he she made greatest!
 Leadership of the army, command of the assembly,
 Arming, contact, advance of the melee,
 Supreme command in warfare

³⁴⁰ This is Machinist’s translation, see Machinist, “The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I,” 64-65.

³⁴¹ Consider other correspondences between Marduk and Tukulti-Ninurta. They are both described in similar terms as merciful rulers. Tukulti-Ninurta shows mercy to the Babylonian merchants upon their capture. Before the place of Shamash he released them and poured oil on their heads; Machinist, “The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I,” 74. This is also likely a political move and Tukulti-Ninurta’s realization that smooth trade with Babylon is still important. Likewise, Marduk is described as merciful (VII 30).

(All) she entrusted to him, made him sit on the dais” (II. 34-36).³⁴²

Tukulti-Ninurta is similarly described as the commander of his army.

Both the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta and the *Enūma eliš* describe the dominant power in similar ways, the former describing its own armies and the latter describing Tiamat/Kingu. In the Assyrian epic, the battle between Tukulti-Ninurta and the covenant-breaking Kassite king takes place.

40' *in-ném-mi-id-ma kak(ki) (^{giš}TUKUL) ^dA-šur la-a*
 ša-nu-ú te-e-be ka-r[a-su']
 41' *u₃ ¹Tukultī-Ninurta (IZKIM.MAŠ) u₄-mu ek-du*
 la-a pa-du-ú ú-šar-dam-m[a x x x]
 42' *qu-rad ^dA-šur ki-ma ši-ib-bi elu (UGU) um-ma-an*
 šar(MAN) Kaš-ši i-[x-x-x]
 Assur's unrivalled weapon met the onslaught
 of [his] ar[my?]
 And Tukulti-Ninurta, the raging, pitless storm,
 made [their blood] flow.
 The warriors of Assur [struck] the king of the Kassites
 like a serpent,³⁴³

This self-description of the Assyrian forces “as serpents” (*ki-ma ši-ib-bi*) is similar to the multiple descriptions in the *Enūma eliš* of Tiamat's monsters. While these monsters are described with multiple terms in II. 25-29,³⁴⁴ they are of the MUŠ.MAḤ.MEŠ class.

These *mušmaḥḥu* are generally understood as a type of serpent or mythical snake in SB.

The snake-like character of the *mušmaḥḥu* is clear since its scales are described as a type of stone in one text.³⁴⁵ This snake-like description of Tiamat's monsters is evident

³⁴² Foster, *Before the Muses*, 447. The overwhelming strength of Tiamat is also evident since even the gods fear her (II 85-94). Often the reactions of the other gods to Tiamat, is silence (II 5). Also see III 15-49 describing Tiamat's rage, the anger Tiamat, and how she makes weapons for Kingu and the monsters.

³⁴³ Foster, *Before the Muses*, 447. For an alternate translation Machinist, *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I*, 110.

³⁴⁴ This is a repetition of Tablet I. Thus Tablet II repeats lines 15-48 of Tablet I.

³⁴⁵ The scales resemble a *pappardillu* stone; see CT 147 K.4206:13.

throughout the *Enūma eliš* (I 134; II 20; III 24, 82). Thus the Babylonian scribe expresses Tiamat, who makes Kingu and the monsters of her army similar to the self-description of the Assyrian forces in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta. If the *Enūma eliš* is responding to early forms of Assyrian imperialism, it would be logical to have the villain of the *Enūma eliš* correspond with a major threat to Babylon. For Tukulti-Ninurta, such rhetoric of the overwhelming king is to be expected, but for the *Enūma eliš* it is clear that whatever historical threat Tiamat/Kingu is supposed to embody, it is of a military nature which threatens the religious authority of Babylonian gods.

These parallels do not imply that the *Enūma eliš* is in direct dialogue with the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta. This analysis maintains that the *Enūma eliš* is responding to various forms of Assyrian imperialism during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I—either before the invasion of Babylon or after it—of which some of those expressions are preserved in the Assyrian epic. Yet the clustering of features already gathered leads to some provisional conclusions. More detailed work could take place regarding scribal culture in Babylon and other indications of its reactions to Assyrian texts around the same time. One must also consider the lines of influence of language, which seem to indicate more Babylonian features in Assyrian texts than vice versa.³⁴⁶ These points admitted, the comparison shows the Marduk expression in the *Enūma eliš* is logically situated in response to Assyrian pressures rather than Kassite political presence. These threats,

³⁴⁶ Babylonian features of language found in the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta are ascribed to the cultural influences the Babylonian literary tradition had on Assyria. The direction of this influence does not negate that the Babylonian epic is responding to the Assyrian one.

combined with the rise of the Marduk cult and the Assyrian taking of the Babylonian capital, initiated the final elevation of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš*.

Summary

The *Enūma eliš* had significant *resonance* for the Babylonians as well as the Assyrians. This is evident in the amount of copies of the poem, the rise of Marduk leading up to the poem and the literary/cultural interactions with it. The poem's unique expression of divinity is not limited to scribal circles but was known broadly. This *resonance* makes it more likely that the Israelites would have been exposed to the expressions of divinity in the *Enūma eliš*. Yet before studying how a moment of CT may have occurred between Israel and Babylon, we must clearly understand the expression of Marduk in its source culture, known as *coherence*. Marduk of Babylon in the *Enūma eliš* was a unique expression of divinity in its ancient Near Eastern setting: a universal and absolute kingship of a warrior and creator.

With *resonance* and *coherence* understood, the only divergence with CT in this chapter is that the motivation for Marduk's final elevation was not a moment of CT. Rather, the questions CT raise about what motivates expressions was informative for understanding Marduk's final elevation in the *Enūma eliš*. This chapter demonstrates those *motivations* are most likely set in response to early forms of Assyrian imperialism, and specifically imperialism during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

With a fuller understanding of the *coherence*, *resonance* and *motivations* that lead to the expression of Marduk in Babylonian culture, we can now turn to the issue of why change occurred to YHWH's kingship. The Assyrian pressure motivating the rise of

Marduk's kingship becomes an instructive historical analogy to understand YHWH's rise and kingship in Israel.

Chapter Five: The Context and Motivations of YHWH's New Kingship

The analysis of chapter two solidified different stages in YHWH's kingship: a 12th-10th century YHWH warrior king versus an 8th century Jerusalemite YHWH creator and universal king. The goal of this chapter is to clarify the context in which change to YHWH's kingship took place. Thus the rise of Marduk's kingship discussed in chapter four operates as a historical analogue to understand the similar change to YHWH's kingship in Israel. YHWH's kingship changed in response to similar historical pressures that the Babylonians experienced under the Assyrian pressure of Tukulti-Ninurta I. We will argue that YHWH's new kingship in Pss 93, 95-99 occurred under Neo-Assyrian imperialism begun under Tiglath-pileser III. This chapter will also spend some time assessing similarities between YHWH and Marduk to demonstrate why a parallel between them is warranted. Only secondarily is this analysis open to the possibility that Israelite scribes culturally translated Marduk's kingship to their own context in reformulating YHWH's divinity. This secondary feature only remains a possibility and is not required for formulating a suitable context for change in YHWH's kingship, thus answering the motivations for change in YHWH's kingship.

Part I: Parallel Expansion: The Similar Histories of Marduk's and YHWH's Kingships

Marduk is a suitable candidate to assess the re-expression of YHWH since both are similar deities, with similar histories and share the ability to attract a variety of elements to their divine natures. Although both deities share similar features in the early stages of their divinities, this does not imply that Israelite scribes were aware of

Marduk's early history. Identifying their shared histories assists in understanding how the deities became related and why the eventual translation of Marduk to YHWH may have taken place.

Marduk and YHWH share parallel expansions in their kingships evident in the movement from their early histories to the height of their expressions in the *Enūma eliš* and Pss 93, 95-99 respectively. In their earliest stages, YHWH and Marduk were relatively unimportant deities. Marduk's early divinity was not connected with a cultic centre; only during the reign of Hammurabi was Marduk explicitly connected to Babylon. Nor did Marduk have any particular connection with an element of nature that made him an important deity. A similar history is true of YHWH. As discussed in chapter 1, YHWH was not originally connected with a cultic centre. There are no indications he was connected to a specific part of nature at his earliest stages. YHWH was thus a relatively minor deity at his earliest stages as texts like Deut 32:8-9 demonstrate.

Related to this early stage, YHWH and Marduk are also outsider deities as opposed to the more popular deities of the main Canaanite and Mesopotamian cults. Across the ANE, we see patterns of outsider deities being related cross-culturally. The early poetry of the HB presents YHWH's geographical origin in the south, and thus outside Israel, but also presents YHWH like Baal from the north. In that poetry there is a strong alignment of YHWH with Baal of Ugarit. Therefore, storm and warrior deity features are used to reify YHWH.³⁴⁷ Like Marduk and YHWH who were outsider deities without a strong connection to a specific cult, Baal was also not the head deity in his early stages. Baal was an outsider compared to the astral features of other members of the

³⁴⁷ Judg 5:4-5 // Ps 69:8-9; Deut 33:2-5; Exod 15:1-18.

divine council at Ugarit.³⁴⁸ At the outset of the Baal Cycle, Baal comes into the divine council from the periphery, to admonish the gods for the way they have allowed Yamm, the god of the sea, to make demands of them (*KTU* 1.2 I 23-28).³⁴⁹ Baal causes the gods to lower their heads (in shame?), upsets the traditional structure of the divine council, and answers the challenge of Yamm in the form of battle. Indeed, the Baal Cycle seems to operate as a legitimizing myth for the institution of the Baal cult at Ugarit among a predominate El cult. As a deity of the periphery, Baal is also associated with other outsider deities. The Egyptian deity with the greatest correspondence to Baal was Seth, who is also represented as a deity on the periphery of the Egyptian pantheons.³⁵⁰ Like the relationship between the outsider deities Baal and Seth, YHWH is a minor deity of the Levant generally considered outside the major deities of the time.

Another shared characteristic of these outsider deities at their early stages is age.

The age of a deity is a difficult aspect to reconstruct, but the outsider deity who

³⁴⁸ Smith discusses Baal compared to the astral qualities of El's family; Shahr and Shalim (dusk), Yarih (the moon), Athtar and Athtart (stars and heaven), and Repesh (new moon) are all given astral qualities in various Ugaritic texts; Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 61-63. These astral features contrast with Baal the storm-god, suggesting Baal's outsider status.

³⁴⁹ Mark S. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Vol I* (VTSupp. 55; New York: Brill; 1994), 266-67.

³⁵⁰ Thus it is no surprise that Seth eventually becomes connected with the foreign deity Baal in the Ramesside period (Dynasty 19); te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, 114. te Velde offers various instances where Seth is associated with foreign deities and peoples. The stela of Pharaoh Merneptah (1213-1203 BCE), in describing the Pharaoh's victory over foreigners, identifies Seth as the god of the Lybians. Seth retains a place in the Egyptian pantheon as one of the gods in the Ennead of Heliopolis. Seth is also an outsider in his association with the trade routes. The Egyptians clearly had an interest in the desert just beyond their borders, which functioned as a door to the trade routes with the rest of the ANE. Silver provides a detailed discussion of Egypt's interest in its surrounding regions from the fourth dynasty on; Morris Silver, "The Mythical Conflict Between Osiris and Seth and Egypt's Trade with Byblos During the Old Kingdom" *Ancient Economy in Mythology: East and West* (ed. Morris Silver; Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1991), 193-196. For our purposes, Silver shows that Seth is associated with trade overseas (PT 54a) and that many of Seth's cultic locations were located at the head of caravan routes during the Ramesside period (1314-1085 BCE); also see, te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, 207. Silver argues for Seth's relation to foreign trade through his association with copper since PT 21 identifies Seth with copper: "[c]opper ore was very early mined in the central and southern Sinai peninsula, a region enjoying close cultural and economic ties to Syria-Canaan;" also see, te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, 207. This ties Seth to a region in which Baal worship was known. te Velde reinforces Seth's outsider status through references to him in geographical locations outside Egypt; te Velde, *Seth, God of Confusion*, 84-85, 97-98, 110-11, 122-24, 129.

challenges others and engages in battle, in place of the “older” deities who cannot handle the challenge, is generally the younger and more virile deity. This is true of Baal in the *Baal Cycle* and Seth in the *Contendings of Horus and Seth*. The parallel extends to YHWH in the early kingship texts and Marduk in the *Enūma eliš*. YHWH of the early YHWH kingship texts is not like the aged El, but a strong, young warrior. Likewise, some have argued that the story line of the *Enūma eliš* is consistent with a young hero who establishes himself by defeating a danger to the elders and then gains a reward in return.³⁵¹ This is not unprecedented in Mesopotamia. Based on Lambert’s outline of the connections between the *Enūma eliš* and the Ninurta traditions, scribes associated warrior features with Marduk and based Marduk upon this younger deity.³⁵² Something similar may be occurring in the mythological background that informs Ps 82. Here the אלהים who rises in the council of the gods could be a young YHWH who challenges the aged gods of the council and establishes authority by that action. It is difficult when reading Ps 82 not to think of a similar scene between Baal and the council in *KTU* 1.2 I 23-28. In their early histories, YHWH and Marduk share many of the same features as other young, outsider, warrior gods.³⁵³

³⁵¹ M.E. Vogelzang, *BIN ŠAR DADMĒ: Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian Anzu Poem* (Groningen: Styx Publications, 1988), 170-76.

³⁵² Lambert, “Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation,” 55-60. See the discussion in H.L.J. Vanstiphout, “Enuma Elish as a Systematic Creed: An Essay,” *OLP* 23 (1992): 45.

³⁵³ There is also a shared rising popularity for Marduk and YHWH evident in the onomastic evidence. Just before the rising of their cities and their deity, the onomastic evidence shows that the cult of YHWH and the cult of Marduk were rising in popularity. Sommerfeld details the Marduk theophoric names of the second millennium, arguing for a more popular name than was first thought. Walter von Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks*, 6. Similar studies have been made of YHWHistic names. See Jeaneane Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew* (JSOTSup 49; Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1988). Also see, Jeffery H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in Light of Hebrew Inscriptions* (HSS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). Tigay has demonstrated predominance in early theophoric YHWHistic names, but has not sustained the conclusion that this evidences sole worship of YHWH early on. Others point to problems with this argument. For example, the identification of

Conglomerate Traditions

Despite their similarity with other deities, a difference distinguishes Marduk and YHWH from other deities in how each accomplishes his rise. YHWH and Marduk share the ability to attract multiple traditions to themselves. While the reasons for this may be unclear, the scribal traditions shaping YHWH and Marduk viewed them as suitable deities on which to attach a variety of divine characteristics. The early history of Marduk is complex given the traditions that are gathered under him in the *Enūma eliš*. The summary in chapter 4 provided some of these traditions such as Marduk taking on the Enlil creator traditions and the Ninurta warrior traditions.³⁵⁴

Likewise, the scribal and state sponsored YHWH of Jerusalem is also given a variety of divine attributes. It is sufficient to list some of them, since more will be discussed later in this chapter. In the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts the warrior king is paramount and most likely adapted from Baal. As we saw this is retained, albeit in a lesser form and heavily revised, in Pss 93, 95-99. YHWH is also a solar deity in parts of the HB, although the date of these traditions has not been determined.³⁵⁵ Similarly,

theophoric names aligned to a particular deity only demonstrates the religious expression of a centralized administration, not all of Israel.

³⁵⁴ Lambert, "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation," 55-60. Also see the discussion in Eckart Frahm, "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere," *Orient* 45 (2010): 5. Also see Lambert, "Mesopotamian Creation Stories," 18-37.

³⁵⁵ For a proposal of solar worship in YHWHism, see J. Glen Taylor, *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archaeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel* (JSOTSup 118; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993). Various scholars have noted this feature; Herbert G. May, "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *ZAW* 55 (1937): 277-78. Uehlinger notes seals and ivories that suggest solar worship in Israel; Christoph Uehlinger, "Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals, Iconography and Syro-Palestinian Religions of the Iron Age II: Some Afterthoughts and Conclusions," in *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals* (ed. B. Sass and C. Uehlinger; OBO 125; Freiburg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 257-89. Also see Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, "Jahwe und die Sonnengottheit von Jerusalem," in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (ed. W. Dietrich and M. A. Klopfenstein; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994), 269-306. Finally, Taylor's review of Wiggins' critique is

Marduk displays elements of Shamash theology in aspects of his divine radiance and judge. Likewise, YHWH is judge who has an eternal word. Then the eventual expression of YHWH as a more removed, transcendent, head deity like El, is similar to Marduk's taking on of Enlil traditions. Arguably, the Psalms of YHWH's kingship hold one of the most condensed collections of divine characteristics in the HB.

Marduk's and YHWH's rises cannot be considered without their relationships to cultic centres. Although YHWH and Marduk are not clearly associated with a city during their early histories, the eventual rise of Jerusalem and Babylon, are integral to the rise of these deities. It is clear that YHWH is associated with Zion and Jerusalemite theology. A variety of texts spend considerable time writing YHWH's presence into Jerusalem: David marches the ark into Jerusalem, the famous building of the house of YHWH in 2 Sam 7 and the repeated use of the possible liturgical refrain *יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת יֹשֵׁב הַכְרֻבִּים*, "YHWH Sabaoth who dwells on the Cherubim".³⁵⁶ Connecting YHWH to Jerusalem was particularly difficult in light of the competing Shiloh tradition and YHWH's choice to dwell there before dwelling in Jerusalem. The Shiloh tradition had to be attended to, but at the same time, had to be replaced.³⁵⁷ YHWH's connection with Jerusalem is

helpful: J. Glen Taylor, "A Response to Steve A. Wiggins 'Yahweh: The God of the Sun'," *JSOT* (1996): 107-119.

³⁵⁶ Mettinger shows how this acclamation is connected with Jerusalem; Tryggve Mettinger, "YHWH Sabaoth, the Heavenly King on the Earthly Throne," in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (ed. T. Ishida. Winona Lake, Indiana; Eisenbrauns, 1982), 109-38. This striking article traces the idea of YHWH Sabaoth back to Shiloh and gives a theory of what this early designation entailed. Most interestingly, Mettinger suggests that the kingship of YHWH was a feature of the Israelite cult at Shiloh in the form of the cherubim throne, and that this concept at Shiloh and Jerusalem reveals a consistency of theological expression between the two sanctuaries. This study centers around two phrases: *יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת* and *יֹשֵׁב הַכְרֻבִּים*, which Mettinger calls the messenger and the cherubim formulas. Mettinger argues for an indirect link between the two formulas and thus suggests the existence of a cherubim throne at the Jerusalem temple.

³⁵⁷ For a thorough analysis of the negative and positive representations of the Shiloh tradition in the HB, see Donald G. Schley, *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History* (JSOTSup 63; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

particularly present in prophetic literature that invests so much theological reflection on divine presence. Faced with the impending reality of Jerusalem's destruction, the prophets reinforce how YHWH could still be considered to "dwell" in Jerusalem by constructing *Shem* (DtrH and Jeremiah) and *Kabod* (Ezekiel) theologies.³⁵⁸ The importance of Jerusalem clearly succeeded. Zion theology intensely viewed Jerusalem as YHWH's house and as the theological centre of Israel and eventually the world (Isa 45:14; Isa 56:7b). Likewise, the Songs of Ascent (Pss 120-134) have in their view Zion as the centre (Pss 122:1-2; 9; 125:1-2; 128:5; 132:7-9, 13; 134:1, 3). As the dwelling of YHWH, Jerusalem is thus linked to the cosmic mountain in ANE myth.³⁵⁹

Likewise, Hammurabi associates Marduk with the important cultic and administrative centre of Babylon.³⁶⁰ The rise of Babylon, and the rise of Marduk, is similar to the rise of YHWH and his association with Jerusalem. The Psalms give a focus to Jerusalem that is similar to that which the *Enūma eliš* gives to Babylon. Marduk's creation of the Esagil reinforces Babylon as the centre in IV 143-46 and especially in VI 67-73. Here the kingship of Marduk is particularly evident since the gods build his house for him, thus legitimizing the divine origins of Marduk's Babylonian kingship as well as the subservience of the gods to him: "After they had finished work on the Esagil, the

³⁵⁸ Tryggve Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. (CBOTS 18. CWK Gleerup, 1982). There has also been a challenge to whether there is a *Shem* theology; Sandra L. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology* (BZAW 318; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).

³⁵⁹ Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain In Canaan And The Old Testament* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972); Othmar Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms* (Winona Lake, Ind., Eisenbrauns, 1997), 113-20. The Jerusalemite context of YHWH's kingship Psalms may be corroborated by another observation. Smith has discussed possible reasons for changes in YHWH's divinity, connected to what he calls the general reduction of myth in the bible. One of his three suggestions for this reduction of myth is when "the absence of literary myth occurred primarily within those circles responsible for the production of the extant national narratives." Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 176. Therefore, the development of YHWH in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship occurring around Jerusalem, corresponds with the general movement of YHWHism promoted by the scribal elite around Jerusalem.

³⁶⁰ von Sommerfeld, *Der Aufstieg Marduks*, 82.

Anunnaki having built their own shrines, Gathered with the 3000 Igigi of above the 300 of the Apsu In the sanctuary they had built as his abode, Sat his divine ancestors at a feast (saying): ‘Behold Babylon, your residence; Sing out joyously! Let there be happiness.’

»³⁶¹ While the rise of both cities raises each deity, it is possible that YHWH was imported into Jerusalem and Marduk was always part of Babylon.³⁶²

Distinguishing the kingship of YHWH and Marduk from other deities does not only occur because of a conglomeration of traditions, but the result that those traditions support. Both YHWH and Marduk become universal and absolute creator kings, and the various expressions are assimilated into their divinities in order to reinforce those kingships. When comparing YHWH and Marduk, their similar histories as deities and similar abilities to attract different expressions of divinity to themselves around specific cultic centers creates an expectation that those expressions of divinity would eventually intertwine.

A Close Reading of the *Enūma eliš* and the YHWH Kingship Psalms

To realize the relevance of these similarities between YHWH and Marduk, recall that chapter 4 demonstrated the *Enūma eliš* combined warrior and creator kingships with absolute and universal power. Thus, when YHWH was also conveyed as a universal-creator king it was not a uniquely Israelite development. By understanding how YHWH’s and Marduk’s kingships are similar, we can appreciate how the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship could be translating Marduk to Israelite religion and also identify any unique Israelite traits in the process of translation.

³⁶¹ Translation by Vanstiphout, “Enuma Elish as a Systematic Creed,” 42.

³⁶² The theory that Marduk was always part of Babylon, is based on a text (YOS 9,2) possibly dated to the Early Dynastic period (2900–2335 B.C.E). This text contains a possible reading of ^dAMAR.UTU (Marduk) who is associated with BAR.KI.BAR (Babylon?). For a discussion, see Lambert, “Studies in Marduk,” 8.

Universal and Absolute Kingships

Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma eliš* makes a unique claim to kingship by linking the warrior and creator features around a universal kingship.³⁶³ Similarly, the Psalms of YHWH's kingship propose a universal view of kingship rooted in the creator deity based on an older form of the warrior model. This difference between combining the warrior and creator in the Babylonian tradition, while focusing primarily on a creator model in the Israelite one, will be elucidated in this chapter. While different in their final focus, given the similarities between YHWH and Marduk's divinities at their height, a reasonable precursor for the expression of YHWH's kingship in the Psalms was Marduk's kingship in the *Enūma eliš*.³⁶⁴

Universal kingship is evident in both YHWH and Marduk. In the Psalms of YHWH's kingship the vision of rule is not limited to Israel and its surrounding nations. For example Ps 95:3 says: *כִּי אֵל גָּדוֹל יְהוָה וּמֶלֶךְ גָּדוֹל עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים*. The same universalism is evident in Ps 96:10 and in other examples discussed in chapter 2. The king's domain extending to all the earth seems like an obvious statement from our perspective on this side of monotheism. Yet in Israel's metaphor of kingship, the early YHWH kingship texts and the surrounding Canaanite forms communicated YHWH's

³⁶³ Marduk not only creates the world with the body of Tiamat (IV 135-38) but also creates humans: *da-mi lu-uk-šur-ma eš-mé-ta lu-šab-ši-ma lu-uš-ziz-ma lul-la-a lu-ub-ni-ma lu-ú en-du dul-lu ilī-ma* "I will congeal blood and form bone, I will bring into being Lullu, whose name shall be 'man' " (VI 5-8). This is Lambert's translation, with the exception of "congeal" (*lu-uk-šur*) which I prefer over "bring together blood"; Lambert, "Mesopotamian Creation Stories," 52. The sense of *kašārum* is bringing elements together, and binding them for the purpose of building (CAD K 1a, 258).

³⁶⁴ This is not to claim that the parallel between YHWH and Marduk was direct. It could have been mediated first through Assyrian reactions to Marduk and Babylon, and second, through the Israelite response against *Aššur* who adopted Marduk's features. Whatever the line of transmission of Marduk to YHWH, the parallels between their kingships are present and need to be explored. For a discussion of direct and mediated parallels, see footnote one in chapter three.

influence by imaging a more narrow and limited sphere in accordance with the types of kingship in the ANE and respective spheres of influence for each deity.

Like the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, Marduk's kingship in the *Enūma eliš* holds the "kingship of the gods" (III 44) that implies kingship over and above the gods. While being head of the divine council is not unique to the ANE, the poem expresses Marduk's kingship over the gods as the holder of the tablet of destinies. This is one way the Babylonian poem demonstrates that Marduk's kingship is unique. Unlike El who at times submits to the other gods (*KTU* 1.2 I 23-25; *KTU* 1.3 I. v 30-33) Marduk decrees fates instead of the gods. In II 161 and III 62, 120 we read: *ep-šu pi-ia ki-ma ka-tu-nu-ma ši-ma-ta lu-šim-ma* "[at] the moving of my mouth, let me always fix fates³⁶⁵ instead of you."³⁶⁶ In the context of the *Enūma eliš*, *ki-ma ka-tu-nu-ma* should be translated "instead of" rather than "like".³⁶⁷ It is in such a context that we must interpret the statements of Marduk's kingship. Marduk holds *šar-ru-tum kiš-šat kal gim-re-e-ti* "kingship over all and everything" (IV 14; // מלך גדול על-כל-אלהים Ps 95:3). The *Enūma eliš* does not use this as a pious expression of their god, but as an expression of real universal kingship.

³⁶⁵ Here, the G stem (*lu-šim-ma*). The idea is not to "fix fates" until the battle with Tiamat is over, but it is an action which is an eternal position.

³⁶⁶ This is the translation adopted by, Lambert, "Mesopotamian Creation Stories," 44; As well by "Enuma Elish," translated by Benjamin Foster (COS 1.111). Talon prefers a more literal rendering: "que ma parole soit comme la vôtre, que je puisse décréter le destin"; Philippe Talon, *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth: Enūma Eliš* (SAA 4; Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2005), 86. This is similar to Labat's "comme vous"; René Labat, *Le Poème Babylonien De La Création* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1935), 107.

³⁶⁷ See the discussion in chapter four by Lambert who argues for the translation "instead of" in Wilfred G. Lambert, "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion," in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek* (ed. W.S. McCullough; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 4.

Stating the nature of kingship in these texts is not as important as demonstrating the power and universal scope of those kingships. The scribes of both the Psalms of YHWH's kingship and the *Enūma eliš* do not merely engage in a repetitive task of stating YHWH's kingship over the gods and all the earth, or Marduk's similar universalism through his control of the tablet of destinies. These scribes are more concerned with demonstrating those statements. One senses in their task a goal of winning over other ideological perspectives to their own. These texts share the literary technique of demonstrating the scope and authority of the kingship by selecting and exploring other elements of divinity under those broader categories. The series of similarities between Marduk and YHWH are due to a scribal selection of similar features of divinity that would best demonstrate the deity's universal and absolute rule.

Divine Nature

One example divine nature in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship and the *Enūma eliš*, which reinforce the universal and absolute kingship of each deity. This is first evident in their physical manifestations of divine kingship. Marduk is *ma-ri-ú-tu ma-ri-ú-tu ma-ri* ^dUTU-ši ^dUTU-ši šá DINGIR.DINGIR *la-biš mé-lam-mi eš-ret* DINGIR.MEŠ šá-qiš *et-pur pu-ul-ḫa-a-tu ḫa-šat-si-na e-li-šú kám-ra*, "The son UTU, the son UTU, the son, the sun, the sunlight of the gods. He wears the radiance (*mé-lam-mi*) of ten [gods], he is decked with³⁶⁸ highness (*šá-qiš*), the terror of fifty [gods] are piled (*kám-ra*) on him" (I 100-104).³⁶⁹ From his birth, Marduk is set for greatness.

³⁶⁸ Reading *et-pur* as a Gt stative of *aparum*.

³⁶⁹ This section of the poem reflects at length on Marduk's physical characteristics (I 91-100). For further discussion on how these features relate to kingship, see H.L.J. Vanstiphout, "Enuma Elish as a Systematic Creed," 40. For an alternate translation to mine see Foster, *Before the Muses*, 442-43.

A specific lexeme is used to demonstrate Marduk's physical manifestation of divine presence. In *Enūma eliš*, *melammu* is an important aspect of Marduk's kingship.³⁷⁰ It describes the son of UTU/Šamaš during the birth of Marduk in Tablet 1: *la-biš mé-lam-mi eš-ret* DINGIR.MEŠ "he wore the divine radiance of ten gods" (I. 103). While the *melammu* of Marduk is established at his birth, the author also uses the *melammu* to describe Tiamat and her monsters: *me-lam-mu uš-taš-ša-a i-li-iš um-taš-ši-il*, "she loaded them with *melammu* and made them equal to gods" (II 24; III 28; 86). In this poem where there is always a contest between legitimate and illegitimate forms of kingship, details are important. The terminative adverbial ending *iš* makes the noun *il* mean "relating to a god", or "god-like". The nature of the terminative adverbial ending is reinforced in the choice of verb. Here the *Št* of *mašalum* means to place something on the same level or equal to something else.³⁷¹ This does not mean that the monsters of Tiamat become gods, but they are similar to the gods and at the same time somehow different. This single scribe, well aware of his purpose, foreshadows that only Marduk can properly order the world of the gods. Rather, the use of *melammu* for Tiamat monsters probably refers more to the elements of fear and horror that are sometimes associated with *melammu*.³⁷²

³⁷⁰ For a further discussion on this term in Mesopotamian religion, and especially its Sumerian origins, see Vladimir V. Emelianov, "On the Early History of *melammu*," (Proceedings of the RAI 53; Winona Lk, Ind: Eisenbrauns), 1109-19. Also see the single monograph on the phrase by Elena Cassin *La splendeur divine: Introduction à l'étude de la mentalité mésopotamienne* (Sorbonne: Paris Mouton & Co., 1968). This study connected the *melammu* with features of terror or fear as in the term *pulhu* with some discussion in paralleling *melammu* with the "glory" of YHWH. Elena Cassin, *La splendeur divine*, 133.

³⁷¹ Jeremy Black, Andrew George and J. Nicholas Postgate, eds., *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden, 2000), 201; CAD M/1, 355.

³⁷² Elements of this word imply fear of the deity. But since it is not likely that Tiamat is creating deities the same as the other gods, *melammu* is also used of demons: Gilg. IX ii 8 (CAD M 2b). Thus, it is also associated with sickness; see Erica Reiner, *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations* (AfO Beiheft 11; Graz: AfO, 1958), 36.

Competing forms of divine radiance constructs a conflict that calls for a resolution. Marduk's *melammu* functions as the corrective to the fearful radiance of Tiamat and her warriors. It is not enough merely to state the legitimacy of Marduk's *melammu* and thus his kingship: rather, it is described in Tablet I before it is named (I. 103). Marduk's divine nature has all the features required of the king: *šam-ḫat nab-nit-su ša-ri-ir ni-ši i-ni-šu/ uṭ-tu-lat si-ta-šu ga-šir ul-tu ul-la*, "His body was magnificent, fiery his glance, he was a hero at birth, he was a mighty one from the beginning!" (I.87).³⁷³ The poem shows how Marduk's radiance is different than Tiamat's. Thus, that divine radiance is stated again later in the poem and is associated with Marduk's role in the battle that he wins (IV 58).

YHWH's divine nature in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship is similar, although it does not use a cognate of *melammu*.³⁷⁴ YHWH's radiance is repeated in Pss 93:1; 96:6; 97:4 and 97:11. For example, Ps 96:6 *הוד־והדר לפניו עז ותפארת במקדשו*, "splendor and majesty (הוד־והדר) are before him, might and beauty (תפארת) are in his holy place". Recently, one dissertation has argued that *הוד־והדר* in Ps 21:6 represents a direct borrowing of *melammu* in Akkadian.³⁷⁵ In part, Aster argues that texts that borrow the

³⁷³ Foster, *Before the Muses*, 442.

³⁷⁴ Despite the lack of a cognate, the relationship between *melammu* and biblical expressions of divine radiance do overlap. For example, it is typical to think of Moses' radiance after coming down from Mt. Sinai as a type of *melammu* known in the ANE (קֶרֶן in Exod 34:35). The improper understanding of this verb as "horn" has led to the Vulgate rendition *quod cornuta esset facies sua* "for horned was his face". A statue by Michelangelo informed by the Vulgate thus represented a horned Moses. More likely, in Exod 34:35, the term means "shone". This is apparent in Hab 3:4 where קֶרֶן is used and clarified in the same sentence: *וַיִּנָּה כְּאוֹר תְּהִיָּה קֶרְנֵי מִיָּדוֹ* "it was bright like a light, rays (קֶרְנֵי) from his hand". In Mesopotamia, it was often the king who displayed the divine *melammu*. At times, the god could remove his divine radiance from the king.

³⁷⁵ The relationship between *הוד־והדר* as a parallel to *melammu* has been discussed in detail by Shawn Z. Aster, "The Phenomenon of Divine and Human Radiance in the Hebrew Bible and in Northwest Semitic and Mesopotamian Literature: A Philological and Comparative Study," (PhD. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2006), 258-331. There Aster shows that *הוד* and *והדר* relates to *melammu* in strength, visual representation of the radiance, and the control of natural forces by the gods.

idea of *melammu* have shared concepts such as: royal power, royal legitimacy, and royal authority. Although Aster does not include Ps 96:6 or the other Psalms of YHWH's kingship, partly since he believes they do not refer to radiance, it seems these Psalms have all the features, according to Aster's categories, required to determine whether the Akkadian concept of *melammu* is used by the biblical writers.³⁷⁶ The Psalms of YHWH's kingship are concerned with royal power (93:1, 4; 96:11-13; 97:3-5; 98:1-2; 99:1) royal legitimacy (95:3-5; 96:3, 10; 97:2, 7; 99:6), and royal authority (93:5; 96:4-6; 98:9; 99:4).

Likewise, both the Psalms and the *Enūma eliš* use the same term to describe how divine radiance is worn by the deities. Marduk "wears" (*la-biṣ*) divine radiance: *la-biṣ mé-lam-mi eš-ret* DINGIR.MEŠ "he wore the divine radiance of ten gods" (I 103). So too YHWH "wears" (לָבַשׁ) majesty and girds on strength (יהוה) (Ps 93:1). While YHWH does not wear the הוֹד־וְהַדָּר referred to in Ps 96:6 (as Ps 104:2 that also specifies YHWH's wardrobe), Marduk and YHWH wear a divine attribute related to kingship.³⁷⁷ In particular, YHWH here wears גִּזְרָה and עֹז. The verb of wearing is the only direct linguistic connection with Marduk's kingship, but the attributes being worn, are similar. *Melammu* is a complex term that is often clarified by the other phrases used in relation to it like *puluḫtu* "terror".³⁷⁸ Likewise, the הוֹד־וְהַדָּר of YHWH in Ps 96:6 appears with עֹז וְתִפְאֶרֶת "strength and beauty". Finally, the reference to

³⁷⁶ Aster only includes Ps 96:6 in his excursus of הוֹד־וְהַדָּר (Shawn Z. Aster, "The Phenomenon of Divine and Human Radiance in the Hebrew Bible and in Northwest Semitic and Mesopotamian Literature," 243-48).

³⁷⁷ In the *Enūma eliš*, many elements of Marduk's kingship function as an alternative to the unwanted kingship of Tiamat and her monsters. Thus as Marduk "wears" divine radiance, the dragons of Tiamat do the same, but in this case they wear terror: (GAL.UŠUM.MEŠ) *na-ad-ru-ti pul-ḫa-ti ú-šal-biṣ-ma* "the wild dragons she clothed with terror" (EE I:137).

³⁷⁸ A.L. Oppenheim, "Akkadian *pul(u)ḫ(t)u* and *melammu*," *JAOS* 63 (1943): 31-34.

wearing a divine attribute appears elsewhere in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship such as in Ps 93 where it appears with עז in Ps 93:1.

Without appealing to the warrior tradition these Psalms link YHWH's radiance and YHWH's power. Specifically Pss 47:3; 96:4; 99:3 define the nature of YHWH as גדול and נורא "feared and great". The combination of the niph'al participle of ירא and the adjective גדול only appear in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship.³⁷⁹ The aspect of fear is likely an echo of the divine warrior tradition since *melammu* also connotes fear.³⁸⁰ Yet in these Psalms, YHWH's nature is not primarily developed with reference to the warrior tradition. Rather in Pss 47:3; 99:3; 96:4, the combination of גדול and נורא "feared and great" occurs in the context of praise. This context numbs the effect of the Israelite warrior tradition and silences the echo of that tradition in the Psalm. Due to the repetitive combination of גדול and נורא only occurring in these Psalms, this is likely a stock phrase of the warrior tradition, set in a new context of praise. Again, in a place where we would expect the warrior aspects of YHWH's kingship to be expanded, and especially indulged with language like גדול and נורא, there is silence. As evident in chapter 2, these Psalms are intentionally moving beyond the warrior tradition to a new expression of YHWH's kingship. Power is not related to YHWH's skill in battle, but in his creative acts which are manifested in his universal rule. Aspects once at home in warrior language, are recycled in a new context.

A connection between Marduk and YHWH cannot be drawn based merely on wearing divine attributes. To characterize further the correspondence between YHWH's

³⁷⁹ For a discussion, see Craig C. Broyles, *Psalms* (NIBCOTS; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 214.

³⁸⁰ CAD M/2, 10; Gilg. IX ii 8.

radiance and Marduk's *melammu*, it is important to note that these features are common across the ANE and do not necessitate a direct connection. Yet like the conglomeration of traditions associated with Marduk and YHWH, the conglomeration of terms that are associated with הדר and *melammu* suggest some correspondence. While the power in Marduk is clearly related to his role as the warrior god, the Psalms here maintain a similar idea of fear, but in the absence of a complete appeal to the warrior tradition.

The Eternal Word

Marduk and YHWH's universal kingships also share the gods' eternal word and its relation to the god as judge. While this feature was not discussed in chapter 2 or 4, it is another way these two texts reinforce the absolute state of kingship and its universal implications.

The metaphor of divine judge in the HB implies that the divine word is also present. Typical phrases that relate to YHWH's judgment, justice and fair rule, imply that these concepts are born from the permanency of YHWH's word.³⁸¹ Since the word of the deity is related to justice and governance, both the Babylonian and the Judahite texts emphasize the stability of both YHWH and Marduk's kingships through the effectiveness of their rule and utterances. The Psalms communicate the permanency of YHWH's

³⁸¹ The ideas of justice/judgment/righteousness (צדק and משפט) governance/fairness (מישרים) are important in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship (Pss 93:5; 97:2; 97:10; 98:9; 97:11; 99:4; 99:7; 99:8). Various other passages relate the word of YHWH to these concepts; for example in Num 23:19 the word of the YHWH is "made to stand" because YHWH speaks it. In one of the Psalms, the חק יהוה "statute of YHWH" (similar to YHWH's decrees in Ps 93:54) is contained in the speech of YHWH (Ps 2:7). In Exod 15:26, listening to YHWH's קול means hearing all the כל־חקיו כל־המצוה "all the statutes and precepts". Likewise, Ps 19:8 speaks about the תורת יהוה and the עדות יהוה. This later idea is the witness or testimony of YHWH, which must be spoken, perhaps in a pattern of a rib lawsuit. Finally, Isa 45:23 identifies what goes forth from YHWH's mouth. Using the same phrase as Isa 45:23, the permanency and effectiveness of YHWH's word that יצא מפִּי "goes from my mouth" is echoed in Isa 55:11.

creation and relate this permanency to YHWH as judge. In 96:10 these concepts are parallel and one logically leads to the other: יהוה מלך אף־תכון תבל בל־תמוט ידין עמים “YHWH is king, really the world is fixed and will not be shaken. He judges the people with uprightness”. The adverb אף introduces another aspect of YHWH’s kingship and explains why YHWH is king. YHWH’s kingship is defined by two ideas: first by the establishment and permanency of the world (אף־תכון תבל בל־תמוט) and also by the judgment of YHWH (ידין עמים במישרים). When these Psalms describe the stability of the throne (93:1-2) they imply stability in both creation and in the divine utterance (judgment) of YHWH. Like YHWH’s kingship is rooted in creation that demonstrates universal kingship, the judgment of YHWH also proves the limitlessness of the king.

YHWH as the judge-king deepens the certainty of that judgment and thus the permanency of YHWH’s word. Psalm 96 begins by telling all the world of YHWH’s deeds (96:3), and ends by describing what types of deeds relate to all the earth. These deeds are not acts of war, but a proclamation of YHWH’s judgment. “For he comes³⁸² to judge the earth, he judges the world with righteousness and the people with his truth” (Ps 96:13). The universalism of this claim is evident no less than the heavens proclaiming this justice in Ps 97:6. Beyond these occurrences, the theme of YHWH’s judgment is also present in Pss 93:5; 97:2; 97:10; 98:9; 97:11; 99:4; 99:7 and 99:8. The importance of this aspect of YHWH’s divinity is not highlighted merely by its repetition, but by its connection back to Sinai (Ps 99:7).

³⁸² Even though a double בא כי in the MT is represented in the LXX with a double ὅτι, the translation interprets the second בא כי as an early pre-MT dittography. If the author or scribe intended emphasis, it would be rendered through a re-duplicated with and infinitive absolute.

Like the role of justice in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, the concern for demonstrating Marduk's universal kingship through the effectiveness of his decrees is also evident in the *Enūma eliš*. The scribe of this poem is concerned to establish that Marduk's decrees will be binding. The justice of YHWH is thus similar to Marduk ordaining destinies: *ep-šu pi-ia ki-ma ka-tu-nu-ma ši-ma-tú lu-šim-ma/ la ut-tak-kar mim-mu-ú a-ban-nu-ú a-na-ku* "When I speak, let me decree destinies instead of you and/whatever I myself create, will not be changed (*la ut-tak-kar*)"³⁸³ (II 160-61; III 60-61; also see II 43-44).³⁸⁴

At times, the permanency of Marduk's word is stated explicitly while at other times it is shown. For example, when Marduk defeats Tiamat, he orders that her parts be used to create the world (IV 135-138).³⁸⁵ The scribe celebrating Marduk's command over speech also demonstrates the permanency of Marduk's word. Marduk negotiates with the other gods to give him the tablet of destinies: *šum-ma-ma a-na-ku mu-tir gi-mil-li-ku-un/a-kam-me ti-amat-ma ú-bal-laṭ ka-a-šú / šuk-na-ma pu-uḫ-ra šu-ter-ra i-ba-a šim-ti* "If I avenge you, [If] I kill Tiamat to save you, Gather the assembly and declare my fate supreme" (II 156-158; III 58-60; III 116-118).³⁸⁶ Marduk's eternal word is not merely an omniscient eternal word, but the poem takes time to celebrate his skill with that spoken word. Thus Marduk's greatness among the gods (IV 3) is directly linked to his lasting

³⁸³ The verb is from *nakarum*: to become different or hostile. Here it is a Dt durative, the passive of the D stem meaning "be changed".

³⁸⁴ This is repeated in the superscription after the fifty names of Marduk. "His word is truth, what he says is not changed, Not one god can annul his utterance" (VII 151-52); Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd ed. Maryland: CDL Press, 2005), 484.

³⁸⁵ For more discussion of this aspect of the text, see Alasdair S. Livingstone, *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 79-81; Wilfred Lambert, "The Cosmology of Sumer and Babylon," in *Ancient Cosmologies* (ed. C. Blacker and M. Loewe; London: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 42-65.

³⁸⁶ Foster reads: "If indeed I am to champion you, Subdue Tiamat and save lives, Convene the assembly, nominate me for supreme destiny". Foster, *Before the Muses*, 455-56.

decree: *ši-mat-ka la ša-na-an si-qar-ka*³⁸⁷ *a-nu-um* “your fate is not equaled, your utterance is [like] Anum’s” (IV. 4). Likewise *lu-ú šá-qa-ta*³⁸⁸ *a-mat-ka* “Indeed, your word shall be supreme” (IV. 15). Similar statements are made in IV 7-9.

The statements and demonstrations of Marduk’s eternal word parallel those in Ps 93:5: *עֲדָתִיךָ נֶאֱמַנְנוּ מֵאֵד לְבֵיתְךָ נְאוּה־קֹדֶשׁ יְהוָה לְאֶרֶץ יָמִים*: “Your decrees are indeed certain, holiness is befitting of your house O YHWH for the length of days.” This passage is notable since the permanency of YHWH’s word is related to his kingship. The opening of the Psalm shows that YHWH’s decree is rooted in YHWH’s kingship. Just as the earth will never shake (*תִּבֵּל בִּלְתִּמּוֹט*) thanks to YHWH’s kingship (Ps 93:1) so too YHWH’s word is firmly established (*נֶאֱמַנְנוּ מֵאֵד*) (93:5). The permanence of the divine word stemming from their respective kingships, is thus a key expression by which Marduk and YHWH demonstrate their universal kingships.³⁸⁹

Creation

Both Marduk and YHWH are also creator deities. The detailed discussion of chapter 2 demonstrated how the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship primarily root YHWH’s kingship in the language of creation. Likewise, the *Enūma eliš* chooses to demonstrate

³⁸⁷ In SB, this is a form of *zikrum* “to command”. CAD, Z, 32. Black, *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*, 443.

³⁸⁸ Stative of *šaquum*.

³⁸⁹ The translation chosen here for *עֲדָתִיךָ* is based on the use of the feminine plural noun in passages like Deut 6:17. There, *עֲדָה* is in a list with the commandments (*מִצְוֹת*) and statues (*חֲקִים*) of YHWH. Other examples of this use of *עֲדָה* are in Ps 25:10; 78:56; 99:7; 132:12 Deut 4:45; 6: 20. The LXX reads its Vorlage in the same sense of “decrees” as chosen here: τὰ μαρτύριά. Interestingly there may be a double meaning to *עֲדָה* that also reinforces the relationship between the divine word and YHWH’s kingship. Others have also suggested that the Ugaritic *‘dt* “throne” may be intended. See, James D. Shenkel, “An Interpretation of Psalm 93:5,” *Bib* 56 (1965): 401-16. The possible meaning of “throne” would fit well in the context of the YHWH kingship Psalms. It would also correspond to a parallelism in this verse where the “thrones” of YHWH is established (*עֲדָתִיךָ נֶאֱמַנְנוּ מֵאֵד*) and parallels the holiness in YHWH’s house (*לְבֵיתְךָ נְאוּה־קֹדֶשׁ*).

the universal and absolute kingship of Marduk through creation as indicated in chapter 4. We need not review the details of each kingship, but it is evident that both texts use the aspect of a creator deity to demonstrate the force of each deities' universal and absolute kingship. In Ps 95:5 *יָדָיו יָצְרוּ הַיָּם וְהוּא עָשָׂהוּ וַיִּבְשֶׁת יָדָיו* “the sea is his and he made it, and his hands formed the dry land”. Likewise, the demonstration of Marduk's kingship is in the creation of the world (EE IV 135-38) and of humans (VI: 5-8). Marduk is even given a test in his skillfulness as a creator deity. He is asked by the gods to make and then unmake a constellation (EE IV: 19-26).³⁹⁰

Summary

Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma eliš* and YHWH's divinity in the YHWH kingship Psalms share a correspondence between the universal notions of their kingships, the natures of their divinity, their eternal words and their creative powers. No single expression between the two divinities stands alone to establish the parallel between them. Rather, a conglomeration of similar traditions accompanies their unique role as universal and absolute kings. Whether the parallel between the two deities is mediated or direct is not relevant. It is the presence of the parallel that matters. Based on this I suggest that Israelite scribes in the 8th century BCE changed YHWH's kingship under similar influences that resulted in the change of Marduk's kingship. The parallel is present and suggests YHWHism, at some point in the 8th century, may have used aspects known in Marduk's kingship first expressed by events likely in the 12th century. The uniqueness of their creator-warrior expressions, shared early histories, parallel expansion and elevation, tied with a similar tendency to gather many expressions to themselves, establishes the

³⁹⁰ For a discussion of Marduk's creative abilities, see Vanstiphout, “Enuma Elish as a Systematic Creed,” 41-42.

parallel. Yet establishing the motivations of change in YHWH's kingship, does not rest on the use of Marduk's kingship by Israelite scribes, but in how the similar context that motivated change in Marduk's kingship informs how we view change in YHWH's kingship.

Part II: Divergences in Translation: Making Marduk's Divinity Coherent in Judah

Despite the similarities that suggest Marduk may have been a source of YHWH's new divinity, there are differences. The differences reflect unique Israelite needs for a universal creator king in response to their own experience of Neo-Assyrian imperialism and thus introduce the most likely context for change in YHWH's kingship. Conversely, the Babylonians also have elements unique to their own tradition. Recognizing the elements unique to both the Babylonian and Israelite expressions of universal kingship, clarifies how Israel may have translated Marduk's divinity, but also placed its own unique Israelite stamp on this moment of translation and offers another element to assess the proper context for change.

The Nature of Worship and Difference

In our YHWH *malak* Psalms YHWH is closer to being the only god than Marduk's relation to the other gods in the *Enūma eliš*. YHWH's trajectory towards monotheism, compared to Marduk, can be understood by analyzing who gives praise to the gods. Both in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship and in the *Enūma eliš*, the status of each deity's kingship is reinforced by the praise they receive. The worshippers in both cases manifest their joy to the deity. For example we read: *i-ru-bu-ma mut-ti-iš an-šar im-lu-u hi-du-ta*, "they went before Anšar, they were filled with rejoicing" (III. 131).

Also consider *iḫ-du-ú ik-ru-bu* ^dAMAR.UTU-*ma* LUGAL, "They rejoiced, they blessed

Marduk as king” (IV.25). In this case, we have various gods (Anšar and Marduk) where the former receives praise from the other gods for giving power to the latter. Likewise, in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship, the worshipers praise YHWH with joy (Ps 96:11). The difference is the group offering praise. In the Babylonian case, it is the gods who enter the divine council and prepare to give Marduk kingship (IV 2). Therefore the gods are *im-lu-u ħi-du-ta* “filled with joy” (III. 131). The ones offering praise are the DINGIR.DINGIR GAL.GAL *ka-li-šú-nu mu-ši-mu* [NAM.MEŠ] “The great gods, all of them, the ordainers of destinies . . .” (III. 130). Conversely, in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship, it is the people who praise YHWH and to a lesser extent the natural world: שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה שִׁיר חֲדָשׁ שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה כָּל-הָאָרֶץ, “Sing out to YHWH a new song, sing out to YHWH all the earth” (Ps 96:1). Here, כָּל-הָאָרֶץ includes both humans and the natural world.

The difference between Israelite and Babylonian universalism of the god-king, is that the former excludes other deities. This is evident in Ps 96:5: “Because all the gods of the people are idols, but YHWH made the heavens” כִּי כָל-אֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֱלִילִים וַיַּהֲרֹגָם עַשָּׂה שָׁמַיִם. A similar statement is made in Ps 97:7-8. It is clear that YHWH and Marduk, despite the correspondences of their kingships, are from different contexts. YHWH in the Psalms is further removed from the polytheistic context of Marduk. While there is a reference to the other gods in 96:4, immediately 96:5 negates their existence כִּי כָל-אֱלֹהֵי הָעַמִּים אֱלִילִים.³⁹¹ Psalm 96:5 seems a direct contradiction to the other

³⁹¹ The LXX uses “demons” δαίμόνια. Chapter 2 referred to this verse as negating the effectiveness of the other gods. Interpreting the כִּי as assevrative (“Indeed, all the gods of the people are idols”) or interpreting the כִּי as adversative “but rather, all the gods of the people are idols” must take into consideration the contrast between v. 4 and v.5. Since YHWH is feared and praised in v. 4, the statement of

references in these Psalms where YHWH is given precedence over the divine council in Ps 97:9.

Further differences make apparent that YHWH's kingship, while based on Marduk's, adapts that divinity for its own unique Judahite context. Unlike in the *Enūma eliš*, nowhere in the HB are the mythological origins of YHWH explained. YHWH is distanced from other gods. There is no birth of YHWH and the gods do not form him. Yet these are foundational elements of the *Enūma eliš* and provide important hints for how the poem adapts and conflates older traditions (I: 91-100). In order to promote the new form of Marduk, the older traditions had to be acknowledged. Marduk negotiates with the other gods to receive his power (II 156-58; III 58-60; III 116-118). This absence or presence of other deities does not decrease Marduk's kingship absolute kingship nor increase YHWH's kingship. These deities still stand as absolute creator kings appropriate to their contexts. Yet each text is attentive to its tradition and context. The *Enūma eliš* gives new expression to Marduk by expressing kingship through elements of his progeny, the sources of his power from Babylonian tradition, and thus the heritage of the other gods now expressed in Marduk. Comparably, Israelite scribes attend to the warrior tradition, echo that tradition from the early YHWH kingship corpus, and move beyond it.

One does not expect other deities in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship composed in an 8th century Jerusalemite context, especially if the early stages of Deuteronomistic centralization were being formulated during this time.³⁹² The shift from Marduk being

the other gods is a contrast to YHWH's power. Thus, interpreting the ׀ as adversative follows the intention of contrast between v. 4 and v. 5.

³⁹² The earliest stages of a DtrH and school of thought is likely given expression in the reforms of Josiah. The DtrH, traditionally Deuteronomy-2 Kings, is most likely made up of various stages in the same school of thought. This general position can be placed into various theories. Some date the composition/compiling of the DtrH to the Neo-Babylonian period (560 BCE) or advocate for two editions

praised by the gods to YHWH being praised by all the earth and humans in particular is not merely a general move away from a polytheistic perspective towards an early form of monotheism; it is a specific adaptation of a new vision of YHWH's kingship proper for an Israelite context. While the presence and absence of other gods is an important difference to remind us that YHWH and Marduk are from different contexts, the more striking divergence is the lack of a warrior tradition. This transition establishes YHWH's growing distance from the other gods where a warrior element of YHWH could not longer be sustained for the new political and religious context.

The Warrior Tradition in the Psalms of YHWH's Kingship

The primary difference between the Babylonian and Judahite traditions is the placement of the warrior deity for these new articulations of kingship. The *Enūma eliš* is replete with images of war and is one of the most important texts for understanding the divine warrior in the ANE. In it we see the preparations for war by Tiamat, and the same preparations by Marduk. In the recognizable ANE form of the divine warrior motif evident in Baal of Ugaritic, Seth and Horus in Egypt and of the early YHWH kingship corpus in the Levant, Marduk wins his kingship through battle. Contrarily, YHWH's

(Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* [JSOTPress 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981]). Others argue for a neo-Assyrian date with three redactions; Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2005). These stages are connected by shared themes and language. Among those themes of criticism of the monarchy, election, and the land, there is also the aspect of centralization of worship. The centralization of worship theme is expressed in the phrase 'To place his name there' (Deut 12:5, 21; 14:24 // 1 Kings 9:3; 11:36; 14:21 2 Kings 21:4, 7); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972). Also see Deut. 1:23; 4:25; 6:18; 19:18; 12:25, 28; 13:19; 17:2; 21:9; 31:29. Scholars have realized the complexity of such identifications; Ehud Ben Zvi, 'Deuteronomistic Redaction In/Among "The Twelve"?' A Contribution from the Standpoint of the Books of Micah, Zephaniah and Obadiah,' in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomena of pan Deuteronomism* (ed. Linda S. Schearing and Steven L. McKenzie; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 232-61. Many questions should be asked to determine whether a text is Dtr or not: what is the level of frequency of Dtr language and how many Dtr phrases occur before a text is classified as such; is the language characteristic or tangential to the DtrH; is there the possibility of mutual influence on the text; how do text-critical issues factor into determining Dtr phraseology given the complexities of language between the MT and LXX?

kingship in these Psalms is not constructed in reference to the divine warrior as in the earlier tradition. Many have rightly argued that the YHWH kingship Psalms presuppose the divine warrior tradition, but on this basis have also assumed the tradition is being maintained throughout these Psalms and not developed in a new direction.³⁹³

The analysis in chapter 2 argued that the more dominant expression of YHWH's kingship in these Psalms is that of a creator deity. As evident in chapter 1, references to the warrior tradition and to the cosmic battle are lacking in these Psalms. The discussion in chapter 2 identified the general trend of the Psalms moving beyond the warrior tradition: the tradition is absent where it would be expected and the Psalms reverse images typical for warrior language and give them new meanings. Perhaps, this could be identified as a moment of the *self-criticism* involved in moments of CT. Israelite scribes realized the unsuitability of the warrior tradition for continuing to express a deity of a small state. Among the growing trends of universalism and major empires, the warrior tradition was increasingly unsuitable to express a deity of a small state. This expression was thus abandoned when Israel faced the challenge of imperialism and universalism in surrounding empires.

There are a few exceptions where the warrior tradition is present. Psalm 97:3 refers to fire defeating YHWH's foes and Ps 98:2 refers to a victory but does not specify what that victory entails. Moreover, Ps 98:1 refers to the hand of YHWH, a phrase typical of the warrior tradition in Israel and the ANE. Clearly the warrior tradition is in the purview of the scribes. Yet given its lack of emphasis and new setting, these brief

³⁹³ Clifford sees the divine warrior motif presumed in Ps 95 and the myth of a warrior god assigned by the council to eliminate a threat as part of the Psalm's expression; Clifford, *Psalms 73-150*, 117, 120. Few have tried to explain the absence of the warrior motif in these Psalms.

references must be contextualized within the Psalms' emphasis: YHWH's creative acts, divine nature, eternal word and concern for his people.

Psalm 97:3 is an interesting example since the Psalm claims fire devours YHWH's adversaries: תִּלְהַט סְבִיב צָרָיו, "it blazes all about his adversaries". In this case, the cosmological battle of YHWH is presumed. In v. 7 the other gods seem useless and subjected to YHWH (v.9). But if YHWH's victory here is meant to echo the divine warrior motif, is the Psalmist merely repeating a well known tradition, or is the Psalmist adding something to it, or re-contextualizing it for a new purpose? The references to YHWH's war and victories are not as pronounced in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship as they are in the early poetic tradition (Deut 33:2-3; Exod 15:1-18; Ps 29; Hab 3). The Psalmist knew of the tradition, and could have repeated it with the same vigor as it appears in Israel's early poetry, but did not. Along with the examples in chapter 2 where the Psalms move beyond the warrior tradition, there are other indications that merely repeating the warrior tradition in its earlier form is not the purpose of the Psalms.

If Neo-Assyrian pressures motivated the change in YHWH's kingship (argued later in this chapter), this was likely due to, in part, Israel's self-recognition that they would not win a military victory. To have Israel's god engage in the rhetoric of divine war was not a viable choice to continue promoting YHWHism. A victory for *Aššur* and the Assyrian kings would mean defeat for YHWH. The common ANE view was that war between empires was also a war between deities. In such cases either the deity abandoned his people (Ezek 11:23), the deity somehow destroyed or overcame the competing deity (1 Sam 5; 1 Kgs 18), or the deity abandoned his people to join the enemy in chastising his

people (Isa 10).³⁹⁴ The biblical tradition is aware of all these options but does not use them in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship; nor do the Psalms of YHWH's kingship use the older form of YHWH's kingship by reiterating the warrior deity. Rather, they avoid having YHWH submit to *Aššur* in any way and re-orientate the source of YHWH's power away from the warrior tradition. One more example will help demonstrate this point.

Let us take up the other likely reference to the warrior tradition: the hand of YHWH and his victory in Ps 98:1-2. The introduction in chapter 1 reviewed several features of the warrior tradition in the early YHWH kingship texts as well as at Ugarit. One of the features of a warrior king in the Levant (as well as in Egypt) is the strength of his hand. This anthropomorphic reference presumes the deity is holding a club or a sword, reflective of the common smiting pose across the ANE.³⁹⁵ Likewise, Exod 15 communicates the power of YHWH's with a reference to his hand (Exod 15:6; 12; 16). Yet, in the Psalms of YHWH kingship, where we would expect to find a reference to the strength of YHWH's hand defeating his enemies, the imagery is re-orientated and stripped of its original meaning. All other aspects of kingship now relate the hand to YHWH's creation as for example in Ps 95:4: "in his hand (בִּידוֹ) are the depths of the earth and the towering mountains belong to him." Furthermore, v. 5 emphasizes the role of YHWH in creation: his is the sea he made (עָשָׂה) "and the land (יַבְשָׁת) his hands

³⁹⁴ Some of these options are explored in the epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I.

³⁹⁵ Baal is typically represented with either a spear or a club. These are often thought to represent the thunder with which Baal was associated since he is a storm deity. In one clear representation of Baal, he assumes the smiting position common in the ANE. This smiting position is evident in the earliest iconographic Egyptian representations. Consider the Narmer Palette (3100 BCE): ANEP, 490 and ANEP, 168. Baal has the club in his smiting hand and the spear of lightning in his other hand. Seth is also represented in this common smiting position (ANEP, 553 and ANEP, 187). Seth's spear may also be the rod with which he seeks to kill other deities in the later Contendings. "I will take my scepter of 4500 *nemset*-weight and kill one of you a day"; Wente, "The Contendings of Horus and Seth", 114.

fashion (יצר).” Likewise וְאִנְחֵנוּ עִם מְרֵעֵיתוֹ וְצֹאֵן יָדוֹ “and we are the people of his pasture, the flock of his hand (יד)” (Ps 95:7).

Admittedly, the references to YHWH’s hand in Ps 98 do echo a warrior tradition, but the tradition is generalized to the point of being amenable to a new form of kingship. While the Psalm begins with the hand of YHWH and YHWH’s salvation, it does not specify what that salvation is. Further, the Psalm does not develop the image of the warrior king, but focuses on a universal kingship (v. 3) followed by a long section of praise. The poem ends with an image of YHWH as judge, not YHWH as warrior. This limited warrior language, overshadowed by a universal kingship that is rooted in the creation theology, combined with the reversal of typical warrior image language in these Psalms, indicates a shift is occurring.

Given the importance of the divine warrior motif in the source culture and in Israel’s own early YHWH kingship corpus, expecting a continuation of the divine warrior motif in Psalms of YHWH’s kingship is not misplaced. With such an expectation, the intentional subversion of that warrior motif is more striking. A formidable context must have lead to the removal of the warrior tradition. In order to understand the transition from divine warrior motif to a universal creator king, we turn to Neo-Assyrian pressure as a motivation for a Judahite/Jerusalemite change in YHWH’s kingship.

Part III: Selecting an Appropriate Context for Change in YHWH’s Kingship

J.J.M. Roberts speculates that the YHWH-kingship Psalms have political and military undertones.³⁹⁶ More recently, Tanner has captured well what may be occurring.

To make a claim that one’s God is the king of the universe is a political statement and the alignment of this claim with real historical conditions at

³⁹⁶ J. J. M. Roberts “The Religio-Political Setting of Psalm 47,” *BASOR* 221 (1976): 129-32. As a result, he suggests that these YHWH-kingship Psalms originated in the Davidic monarchy.

the time will determine the theological understanding of a phrase such as Yahweh-*malak*.³⁹⁷

HB scholars have recognized that YHWH's kingship in the Psalms is of a particular type and has its origins in a proper historical context.³⁹⁸ They have also recognized the significance of these universal statements, but have not explored how YHWH's divinity arrived at this universalism nor articulated the differences between the stages of YHWH kingship.

The introduction in chapter 1 briefly summarized the debate over recognizing Assyrian presence in the Levant. That debate revolves around the question whether Assyria forced its religious practices on those it conquered or not. One side believes that the Assyrian presence did not directly force religious expressions on those they conquered.³⁹⁹ Another group believes the lines of influence were more pronounced and Israel directly responded to Assyrian imperialism and perhaps some forms of religious infiltration.⁴⁰⁰ Recent studies have shifted from this debate to explore Assyrian religious interests and spy networks in the Levant and to assess whether the HB preserves accurate knowledge of the Assyrian system.⁴⁰¹ The general position now, with which this study

³⁹⁷ Tanner, *The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality*, 124.

³⁹⁸ Levine has argued that the new expressions of YHWH's monotheism originated in response to Assyrian pressures; Baruch A. Levine, "'Ah Assyria? My Rage' (Isa 10:15): Biblical Monotheism as seen in an International Political Perspective," *Eretz-Israel* 27 (2003): 136-142. This was done in a similar way in Baruch A. Levine, "Assyrian Ideology and Israelite Monotheism," *Iraq* 67 (2005), 411-427. Levine's work establishes a feasible context in which Israelite responses to Assyrian pressures could have taken place. His study focuses on Israelite monotheism while this study is concerned with a more specific expression of divinity, YHWH's kingship.

³⁹⁹ Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* (SBLMS 19; Montana: Scholars Press, 1974). Also see the work of John W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians* (SBTS 26; London: SCM Press, 1973).

⁴⁰⁰ Spieckerman, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidzeit*; Holloway, *Aššur in King! Aššur is King!*; Peter Dubovský, "Tiglath-pileser III's Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.: Historical Background of Isa 7; 2 Kgs 15-16 and 2 Chr 27-28," *Bib* 87 (2006): 153-170.

⁴⁰¹ Dubovský shows how the Assyrian intelligence service was always involved. Dubovský compares the biblical texts detailing Assyrian presence to Assyrian records in other vassal states. For example, Dubovský considers Rab-shaqeh's detailed knowledge of religious matters in Jerusalem to

agrees, is that while Judah may not have been responding to one specific, forced Assyrian religious policy, the Assyrian military and political presence “deeply influenced political and religious events in Israel and Judah in the second part of the eighth century B.C.”⁴⁰² Given that the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship are Judahite texts dated to the 8th century and originating in Jerusalem, what reasons can this study present for the Neo-Assyrian period as a suitable context for the changes in YHWH’s kingship?

The following analysis will focus on the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.).⁴⁰³ Tiglath-pileser III represented a new change in Assyrian policy and strategy; Machinist notes: “In Assyrian terms, the second half of the eighth century was equally important, for it marks, under Tiglath-pileser III and his successors, the beginnings of an organized imperial system, involving permanent conquest or control particularly over western Syria and Palestine where only periodic raids to gather ‘tribute’ had been the pattern.”⁴⁰⁴ Under Tiglath-pileser III Assyrian imperialism took on a new form.⁴⁰⁵ While this form had roots in earlier Assyrian claims of world domination, in the 8th century

accurately reflect Assyrian interests; Peter Dubovsky, *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and its Significance for 2 Kings 18-19* (Biblica et Orientalia 49; Roma: Editio Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2006), 21. Thus Dubovský finds evidence that the Assyrians used psychological warfare and superiority over the Judahites.

⁴⁰² Peter Dubovský, “Tiglath-pileser III’s Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.: Historical Background of Isa 7; 2 Kgs 15-16 and 2 Chr 27-28,” *Bib* 87 (2006): 153. This is echoed by Peter Machinist, “Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from Second Isaiah,” in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (ed. W. G. Dever and S. Gitin; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 237.

⁴⁰³ This name, the standard one used in Assyriology and biblical studies, is not the king’s Akkadian name. “Tiglath-pileser” is the biblical interpretation of the Akkadian name *Tukultī-apil-Ešarra*. See RIMA A.0.87.1 ii 85 and Summ. 1; Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (Magnes Press: Jerusalem, 1994), 122.

⁴⁰⁴ Peter Machinist, “Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah,” *JAOS* 103 (1983): 722.

⁴⁰⁵ Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (Magnes Press: Jerusalem, 1994), 9; Dubovský, “Tiglath-pileser III’s Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.,” 1.

those claims began to take on a more tangible form.⁴⁰⁶ In summarizing this new Assyrian imperialism, Beaulieu compares the rise of the Assyrian empire to Rome. The Neo-Assyrian period was not merely the rise of a major empire, but included a shift in the rhetorical and the ideological expressions of Assyrian nationalism matched with practical policies to achieve its vision.⁴⁰⁷

It is impossible to identify the exact Assyrian king to which YHWH's new kingship responded. The reality is that one king was not the single cause of the change in YHWH's kingship.⁴⁰⁸ The psalms of YHWH's kingship respond to a general Neo-Assyrian strategy that began under Tiglath-pileser III. Thus, some brief justification for focusing on one Assyrian king is needed.

The analysis of Babylon's change to Marduk in chapter 4 is an instructive historical analogy in selecting Tiglath-pileser III. The insights of CT that illuminated the Assyrian-Babylonian context as a catalyst for Marduk's change indicate that determining a context for YHWH's change should also identify a major political or military threat. In chapter 2 the cultic orientation of the Psalms of YHWH's kingship as well as the broad indications of linguistic dating reinforced, for these Psalms, a Jerusalemite context in agreement with Mowinckel, Eaton, Brettler and Howard. Therefore, we must look for a

⁴⁰⁶ The early claims by Assyria of world domination and their tactics were already in early Mesopotamia. For a discussion, see Simo Parpola, "Assyria's Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE and Its Long Term Repercussions in the West," in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina* (ed. W. G. Dever and S. Gitin; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 100. The inability of the Assyrian empire to maintain control without the policies of Tiglath-pileser III is apparent in the various rebellions by the western nations in the 9th and early 8th century. One example is the northern coalition in 2 Kings. For the Assyrian perspective of similar issues in controlling other empires, see Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East* (Vol 1: London: Routledge 1994), 482-93; RIMA 2-3.

⁴⁰⁷ Beaulieu, "World Hegemony, 900-300 B.C.E.," 49.

⁴⁰⁸ For example Bradley Parker, *The Mechanics of Empire: The Northern Frontier of Assyria as a Case Study in Imperial Dynamics* (Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001).

period of time in which the cultic and scribal centre of Judah, and Jerusalem in particular, became aware of and experienced the Assyrian threat.

We could start with Shalmaneser III (858-824 BCE), the first Assyrian king to conquer the west (known as *eber nāri* “across the river” [Euphrates] to Assyria). Yet Shalmaneser’s role in the Levant was limited and did not affect Judah in any significant way. Therefore, the changes in YHWH’s kingship Psalms did not likely occur before 858-824 BCE. Before this the Assyrian kings had not been involved in the West, particularly Judah, in a major way. While Tiglath-pileser I (1114-1076 BCE) went west a number of times, the Aramaeans held him off until the Assyrian empire went into a period of decline.⁴⁰⁹ After the reign of Shamshi-Adad V (823-11 BCE) there was another period of decline in Assyria, leaving the west again untouched. This continued during the reign of Adad-Nirari III (810-783 BCE), who was held back by Urartu.⁴¹⁰

The conflict of Assyria with the surrounding kingdoms and coalitions provided a buffer zone against Assyrian influence on Judah. Specifically, Israel and its northern coalition was another layer of protection for Judah. Since the Levantine states formed two major coalitions during the reign of Shalmaneser III (858-824), there was a reasonable expectation of success at defending the Levant from Assyrian expansion.⁴¹¹ In the north many small states joined forces (Sam’al and Patinu) while the Damascus-Hamath coalition also formed, which included Egypt, Byblos and Israel.⁴¹² The coalition during the reign of Shalmaneser III formed a significant protective barrier for Judah and its

⁴⁰⁹ Albert K. Grayson, “Shalmaneser III and the Levantine States: The ‘Damascus Coalition Rebellion,’” *JHS* 5 (2004). http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_34.pdf.

⁴¹⁰ For a discussion of Adad-Nirari III and the ineffectual presence of Assyria in the west, see Carl Ehrlich, *The Philistines in Transition: A History from ca.1000-730 B.C.E.* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 85-86. Here Ehrlich summarizes much of the earlier scholarship supporting the ineffectual nature of the Assyrian army before Tiglath-pileser.

⁴¹¹ Grayson, “Shalmaneser III and the Levantine States.”

⁴¹² Grayson, “Shalmaneser III and the Levantine States.”

capital against the full implications of Neo-Assyrian pressure. While Israel volunteered submission to Shalmaneser III in 841 (evident from Jehu's submission on the black obelisk),⁴¹³ there is no evidence that Shalmaneser III entered Judah. If we were looking for a more intense pressure for Judah, similar to what Babylon experienced under Tukulti-Ninurta I, the reign of Shalmaneser III would not be appropriate.

Searching for a later time, there is the more obvious choice of the Assyrian king Sennacherib (704-681 BCE). On the surface, Sennacherib's pressure on Judah and his attack on Jerusalem affords the best opportunity to focus intense pressure for Judah. Yet recent studies have questioned whether a siege actually occurred. While there was pressure on Jerusalem from the Assyrian empire, it is questionable whether there was a full military siege.⁴¹⁴ If this is true, Sennacherib's threat is similar to Tiglath-pileser III: an impending Assyrian presence that was threatening Judah but not attacking it. While Sennacherib's campaigns were part of the larger Neo-Assyrian expansion, there are a variety of differing opinions in this area of scholarship in biblical studies that we do not have the space to work through properly here.⁴¹⁵ Also, since this study is not attempting to identify a particular king as the source of YHWH's change, and only the general policies of the Neo-Assyrian empire to which Judah was reacting, it is more helpful to study the source of Neo-Assyrian policy in the west rather than its later manifestations. Furthermore, the Judahite prophets, and particularly First-Isaiah's responses to early forms of Assyrian imperialism, show that interaction with Neo-Assyrian presence was

⁴¹³ The submission of Jehu occurs during the reign of Shalmaneser III 858-824 BCE. See 2 Kings 9:14; 10:4 and Daniel Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia: Volume I. Historical Records of Assyria from the Earliest Times to Sargon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926), 590-91.

⁴¹⁴ Paul S. Evans, *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18-19* (VTSup 125; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

⁴¹⁵ Evans, *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings*, 1-26.

already underway in 769-740 BCE, years before the reign of Sennacherib (704-681 BCE).⁴¹⁶ Focusing on Tiglath-pileser III (744-727 B.C.) offers a fresh perspective to biblical questions typically dominated by rearticulations and analyses of the Sennacherib event and scholarship surrounding it.

The variety of information available about Tiglath-pileser III's reign and the diverse set of texts offer a fresh perspective within biblical studies for discussions of the Neo-Assyrian presence in Israel. These include biblical texts from a northern Israelite perspective (2 Kgs 15:29-31) and texts from a Judahite point of view (2 Kgs 15:32-16:20; Isa 7:1-25; 2 Chr 27:1-28, 27). Then the Assyrian perspective is available from Annals 18, 23, 24, Summary Inscriptions 4, 9, 12,⁴¹⁷ Eponym Canon C^{b418} and less rhetorically motivated letters ND 2064, 2417, 2430, 2686, 2715, 2716, 2766, 2767,⁴¹⁹ as well as reliefs from Nimrud. Where known, the date of all these sources corresponds to the reign of Tiglath-pileser III and the first instances of a significant Assyrian presence in the west.⁴²⁰ This combination of material from a wide variety of sources and perspectives provides a unique opportunity to articulate the initial impact of the Assyrian presence in Judah.

⁴¹⁶ The role of First-Isaiah will be discussed later in this chapter. While there is a tendency in Isaiah studies to move beyond the traditional tripartite division by Duhm, accepting that division is still helpful. Various sections of First-Isaiah are comfortably set in an 8th century context, in Jerusalem. For details of this context, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 99-110.

⁴¹⁷ Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (Magnes Press: Jerusalem, 1994).

⁴¹⁸ Allan R. Millard, *The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire 910-612 BC*, 44-45.

⁴¹⁹ H.W.F. Saggs, *The Nimrud Letters, 1952* (CTN 5; London, 2001), 150-66.

⁴²⁰ For example, a text like ND 2686 has an uncertain date.

The Nature of Neo-Assyrian Imperialism under Tiglath-pileser III

In contrast to the kings before him, Tiglath-pileser III had a specific role in the Levant that changed the policy, strategy and the success of Assyrian expansion.⁴²¹ Clearly his purpose in the Levant was not solely to control Bit-Omri and Judah, but that interaction was likely initiated by Assyria's war with Urartu in the east of Anatolia. Tiglath-Pileser III pursued Urartu back to its capital and won many other victories in the area, like defeating the Neo-Hittite kingdom Unqu as well as defeating Hamath in 738.⁴²² Damascus and Israel assisted Hamath in their resistance to Neo-Assyrian presence. Then in 732 BCE, Hamath and Damascus were defeated and the north integrated as an Assyrian province of Megiddo. This victory allowed Tiglath-pileser III to have a greater role in the Levant, and meant a more real Assyrian presence closer to Judah than with previous Assyrian kings.⁴²³

This Assyrian king's success is due to specific policies that resulted in an intentional and very successful campaign.⁴²⁴ While these policies will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter, a brief summary of them demonstrates the type of pressure that Judah would have faced. Tiglath-pileser III had a policy not to conquer then leave, but sought to bring political stability to the Levant in order to retain control over it.

⁴²¹ Parpola discusses the specific strategies of Assyria, beginning in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, in using elites to promote Assyrian culture; Parpola, "Assyria's Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE," 101-102.

⁴²² For further discussion of Tiglath-Pileser III's campaigns in the west, see Nadav Na'aman, "Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against Tyre and Israel (734-732 B.C.E.)," *Tel Aviv* 22 (1995): 268-78; reprinted in Nadav Na'aman, "Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against Tyre and Israel (734-732 B.C.E.)," *Ancient Israel and its neighbors: Interaction and Counteraction* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 56-67.

⁴²³ Luis Robert Siddall, "Tiglath-pileser's III's Aid to Ahaz: A New Look at the Problems of the Biblical Accounts in Light of Assyrian Sources," *ANES* 46 (2009): 93-106.

⁴²⁴ Dubovský, "Tiglath-pileser III's Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.," 153-54.

He was motivated to bring about world domination through specific strategies.⁴²⁵ The goal was to have more control over vassals who could sometimes be unstable partners, and convert them to a provincial system.⁴²⁶ Tiglath-pileser III thus standardized practices that were used by successive Assyrian kings in the west.⁴²⁷ Specifically, “Tiglath-pileser aimed at expanding the core area by systematically reducing semi-independent vassal countries to Assyrian provinces directly controlled by the central government”.⁴²⁸

Dismantling the Syro-Ephraimite alliance, in the context of these other changes, made the threat to Judah more apparent than in any other period.⁴²⁹

The reality of this threat is evident in the Judahite characterization of this period, first by a feeling of isolation and second, by a self-criticism of its leadership. The reason for Judah’s isolation is rooted first in the internal problems between Judah and Israel. The Syro-Ephraimite alliance was made up of Tyre, Damascus and Israel. In their role against Assyria, they also formed an alliance against Judah (2 Kgs 16:5-9). The reasons for this

⁴²⁵ The impact of Assyrian expansion has been studied in various territories. The breadth of that expansion and influence is apparent in studies such as: Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, “The Ideological and Political Impact of Assyria Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries BC,” in *The Heirs of Assyria* (ed S. Aro and R. M. Whiting; Melammu Symposia 1; Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Corpus Project, 2000), 89-111. Lanfranchi helpfully uses the archaeological record and evidence of Near Eastern pottery in Greece as well as studies the battle between Sargon and the Ionians.

⁴²⁶ Any remnants of the vassal system were now met with new conditions, so if a vassal violated any aspect of the treat, they would be destroyed. See the discussion in Parpola, “Assyria’s Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE,” 101.

⁴²⁷ These repeated strategies appear on Annals 5:3-4; 9:1-4; 10:1-4; 11:5-6; 16:4-8; 25:6-12.

⁴²⁸ Parpola, “Assyria’s Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE,” 100. Also see further discussion of this in Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria*, 9 and Paul Garelli “The Achievement of Tiglath-Pileser III: Novelty or Continuity?” in *Ah Assyria Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (ed. by Mordechai Cogan and Israel Eph’al; Scripta Hierosolymitana 33; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991), 46-57.

⁴²⁹ For the biblical evidence, see 2 Kgs 17:6, 24; 1 Chr 5:26. In the Assyrian inscriptions we read: “The land Bit-Humri (= Israel), all of whose cities I had utterly devastated in my former campaigns, whose [people] and livestock I had carried off and whose (capital) city Samaria alone had been spared: (now) they overthrew Peqah, their king” Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (Magnes Press: Jerusalem, 1994), Summary Inscription 13. Likewise: we read “The land Bit-Humri (= Israel): I brought to Assyria [. . .], its auxiliary army, [. . .] and an assembly of its people. [They (or: I) killed] their king Peqah and I placed Hoshea [as king] over them.” Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria: Critical Edition with Introductions, Translations and Commentary* (Summary Inscription 4.)

are unknown, whether it was that Judah would not join the anti-Assyrian alliance or whether it was rooted in a left-over dispute between states in the Levant. The result of having no positive relationship with the defeated coalition was: “Thus, the picture presented in the Assyrian inscriptions is of Judah being isolated from the regions that it had controlled during the reign of Uzziah” (769-740 BCE).⁴³⁰ First Isaiah confirms this situation: וְנוֹתְרָה בְּתִצִּיּוֹן כִּסֵּכָה בְּכָרֶם, “So daughter Zion was left over like a booth in a vineyard” (Isa 1:8).⁴³¹ After the attacks on Samaria and an exile of the northern kings, combined with the new threat of the Neo-Assyrian Empire that favored a provincial system over the vassal system, Judah and Jerusalem felt isolated (Isa 1:1-9).⁴³²

Secondly, the discussion in chapter 3 identified that moments of CT are motivated by, in part, a self-criticism that leads to seeking other forms of expression. This self-criticism is apparent by Judah during the period of Assyrian threat. There are various versions of the Judahite reflection on the Syro-Ephraimite campaign and its effects for Judah. 2 Kings 15:37 and Isa 7:1 reflect on the northern coalition’s pressure against Judah. Since Ahaz asked for Assyrian help against Israel and Damascus (2 Kgs 16:7-9; 2

⁴³⁰ Hayim Tadmor, “Azriyau of Yaudi,” in *Studies in the Bible* (ed. C. Rabin; Scripta Hierosolymitana 8; Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961), 238-39.

⁴³¹ In the midst of this isolation, one key effect on Judah was Tiglath-pileser’s administrative reorganization towards the provincial system. In Israel to the north, Pekah was replaced by a pro-Assyrian king Hoshea (Summ 4:17; 9:10; 13:18; 2 Kings 15:30) and Samaria was now called Bit-Humri. Aram became an Assyrian province and the Transjordan fell under direct control of the now Assyrian province of Damascus. With the northern coalitions dismantled and Egypt retreating back to its own territory, Judah must have felt naked in the face of the Neo-Assyrian imperialistic machine. In the various sources where Judah reflects on the fall of the north and their own potential fate under Assyrian occupation, we gain some insight into their sense of isolation.

⁴³² Machinist alerts us to the reality that First-Isaiah’s language may be in reaction to Neo-Assyrian rhetoric. Isaiah 1:7 reads: אֶרֶצְכֶם שְׂמָמָה עֲרִיכֶם שְׂרִפּוֹת אֵשׁ אֲדַמְתֶּכֶם לְנִגְדְכֶם “Your land is desolate, your cities are burned by fire, your country is consumed in front of strangers”. Likewise an inscription of Aššurbanipal II reads: *āla appuīl aqqur ina išāti ašrup ākulšu* “The city I devastated, destroyed, burned with fire, consumed it”. For translation of the Akkadian and discussions, see Peter Machinist, “Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah,” *JAOS* 103 (1983): 724. For a more complete discussion of the fall of Samaria, see Bob Becking, *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

Chr 28:16), the theological reflection for the Judahite tradition and the Deuteronomist, cast any association with Assyria as Ahaz's fault (Isa 7:17; 2 Kgs 16:2-8). Thus, self-criticism of the monarchy is an important feature of this time.

The threat to Judah witnessed by various versions in the biblical tradition, means Ahaz could not have been unaware of Neo-Assyrian policies and threat, and indeed, the writers of this account were not unaware either (2 Kgs 15:29). What were the effects of this for Judah? Could Tiglath-pileser III's campaign in the Levant, and Judah's leaders failed response to that presence, have motivated Judahite scribes to change YHWH's kingship? To answer this question we use Assyrian texts to ask what aspects of divinity in the YHWH's kingship Psalms respond to the Assyrian imperialistic policies under Tiglath-pileser III.

Neo-Assyrian Imperialism and the Psalms as Response

The Neo-Assyrian kings imagined themselves as rulers of the whole world. In Summary Inscription 11, Tiglath-pileser III claims for himself *šarru dan-nu šár kiššati* (KIŠ) *šár māt Aš-šur šár Bābili* (KA.DINGIR)^{ki} *šár māt Šu-me-ri u Akkadī*^{ki} *šár kib-rat erbetti* "the mighty king, king of the universe, king of Assyria, king of Babylon, king of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four quarters."⁴³³ The features of this new Assyrian imperialism correspond with those of YHWH's divinity in the kingship Psalms. This correspondence suggests an Israelite response in the Psalms to this Neo-Assyrian rhetoric and the policies that reinforced it. Specifically, YHWH's universal and absolute kingship can be contextualized as a response to the Neo-Assyrian policies that also attempted to instill a universal rule. The following discussion studies the universal kingship of YHWH

⁴³³ Summ 11.1 (Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 195); Tadmor's translation.

as a response to Neo-Assyrian economic, cultural and religious policies in the west through the lens of Tiglath-pileser III.⁴³⁴

Economic Policy

A variety of economic policies promoted the Neo-Assyrian empire and its goal of universal rule. These policies were essential for establishing world domination, which before Tiglath-pileser III, relied on vassal states and royal marriages. Economically, the Neo-Assyrians achieved universalism by introducing standardized systems of taxation and measurements.⁴³⁵ The risk for Judah, as a vassal, was becoming Assyrianized by a new economy that promoted the needs and influence of the Assyrian empire.⁴³⁶

Before the introduction of a standardized economic system, the preparatory action to economic integration was deportation. Beaulieu admits that such deportations were not an Assyrian invention, but argues the grand scale upon which this empire performed those deportations was significant. Tiglath-pileser III, Sargon and Sennacherib deported what scholars estimate to be more than 80% of the population (or 1,000,000 deportees).⁴³⁷ Tiglath-pileser III instituted this policy on a grand scale, especially with former vassals who were neither paying tribute to the Assyrian empire nor providing

⁴³⁴ These categories are somewhat superficial. The policies of Neo-Assyrian imperialism could be placed in multiple types of categories. For example, their strategies of war or their collection of intelligence would not easily fit under these categories.

⁴³⁵ Simo Parpola, "Assyria's Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE," 99-111; J. Nicolas Postgate, *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire* (Studia Pohl: Series Maior 3; Roma: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1974); J. Nicolas Postgate, *Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1976), 63-72; Karen Radner, "Money in the Neo-Assyrian Empire," in *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia (MOS Studies I)*; ed. J. G. Dercksen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 127-57; Seymour Gitin, "Tel Mique-Ekron in the 7th Century B.C.E.: The Impact of Economic Innovation and Foreign Cultural Influences on a Neo-Assyrian Vassal City-State," in *Recent Excavations in Israel: A View to the West* (ed. S. Gitin; Archaeological Institute of America, Colloquia and Conference Papers 1; Dubuque, Iowa: Archaeological Institute of America, 1995), 61-79.

⁴³⁶ Moshe Elat, "The Economic Relations of the Neo-Assyrian Empire with Egypt," *JAOS* 98 (1978): 20-34.

⁴³⁷ Beaulieu, "World Hegemony, 900-300 B.C.E.," 52; William R. Gallagher, "Assyrian deportation propaganda," *SAAB* 8 (1994): 57-65.

troops.⁴³⁸ Various sources from his reign in the west demonstrate deportation was a major technique of imperialistic propaganda. In just one area, that of Rezin of Damascus, it is reported that 800 people were captured, as well as 591 cities of the 16 districts of Damascus (Ann. 23. 13-16).⁴³⁹ Similarly, Annals 18 and 24 deal with the 16 districts of what could be identified as Bit-Humri, and thus Israel.⁴⁴⁰ A similar view of mass deportations is given in the Nimrud letters, where the topic of deportation dominates the internal Assyrian debate over foreign policy.⁴⁴¹ The knowledge of Assyrian deportations in the book of Kings roughly corresponds with Annals 18 and 24, identifying 13,520 deportees.⁴⁴² The large-scale deportations known to Israel were a real threat for Judah; they faced the possibility of becoming an Assyrian province, becoming Assyrian citizens and at the very least paying tribute to Assyria and providing troops.

⁴³⁸ Donner outlines three major stages in Tiglath-pileser III's process of new expansion: to maintain and strengthen vassals, to replace the vassal ruler for a more loyal one at the first sign of disobedience, and to implement immediate provincialization to any vassals demonstrating military resistance; Herbert Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzüge* (ATDE 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 299-300. For a summary of Donner and a brief description of Tiglath-pileser III's role in the Levant, see Ehlich, *The Philistines in Transition*, 85-89.

⁴³⁹ Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 80.

⁴⁴⁰ There is some damage in the tablet at this point. The reconstruction of *Bit-Hu-um-ri* is Tadmor's; Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 80. Such a reconstruction is also discussed in Tomoo Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (BZAW 142; New York: de Gruyter, 1977), 102, 124. Concerning this Assyrian term for Israel, identifying them as the house of Omri; Klaas A.D. Smelik, "King Mesha's Inscription: Between History and Fiction," in *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israel and Moabite Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 61-63; Kent P. Jackson, "The Language of the Mesha Inscription," in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab* (ed. A. Dearman; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989), 96-130.

⁴⁴¹ From the Nimrud letters, we tend to get a less exaggerated view of the Assyrian mindset than is presented in the Annals. In these letters, debates occur regarding policy and intervention in the west. Debates occur between officials about the treatment of those captured, and where they should be stationed, Assyrian officials attempt to defend themselves to the king and there is a general openness to, and critique of, the addressee towards the addressed. In this genre of writing the details about war and conquered territories, these deportations are a regular part of Assyrian policy. For example in ND 2437 the moving of forces from an Assyrian official to the king is discussed in detail. Here the official requests Assyrians (or other foreigners) for the city, noting there is no Assyrian official over the city; see Henry W.F. Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters, 1952* (Cuneiform Texts From Nimrud 5; Great Britain: Cromwell Press, 2001), 169.

⁴⁴² Nadav Na'aman, "Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against Tyre and Israel (734-732 B.C.E.)," *Tel Aviv* 22 (1995): 273.

The solution to a policy like deportation was an elevation of YHWH to a place where the Judahite deity was in complete control. As discussed in chapter 2, universalism is a key expression of YHWH's kingship in those Psalms. For example, in Ps 95:3 **בִּי אֵל גָּדוֹל יְהוָה וּמֶלֶךְ גָּדוֹל עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים**. The same universalism is evident in Ps 96:9-10; **כָּל-הָאָרֶץ** will bow down before YHWH's glory. Psalm 97:5b introduces the kingship of YHWH and shows that it extends over the whole earth (v. 9). Likewise, Ps 98 reinforces this aspect of divinity since it is revealed to **הַגּוֹיִם** (v. 2). A fuller explanation of this view of YHWH is in Isa 10:5-6, which claims the Assyrian presence as the rod with which YHWH attacks Israel. In light of the economic policy of deportation and creation of a homogenized Assyrian people, YHWH's universal kingship is an appropriate response to the economic policies practiced in the Neo-Assyrian period. With YHWH in control of all nations, if deportation were to happen, it would be YHWH's will. While these Psalms do not explain the specific response of YHWH to Assyrian imperialism, as is done in First-Isaiah, they represent a change in YHWH's kingship from the earlier form, in the same geographical and chronological space as First-Isaiah. Articulated another way, the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are the cultic expression of YHWH's divinity that would allow the prophetic tradition in First-Isaiah to answer the problem of Neo-Assyrian pressures; the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are the theology and First-Isaiah is the application of that theology.

Cultural Policy

The Psalms of YHWH's kingship also promote Israelite identity that would have been threatened under the cultural policies of the Neo-Assyrian empire. Such policies are

apparent in the adoption of Aramaic as the *lingua franca* of the empire.⁴⁴³ The choice of a west Semitic language in the process of conquering the west was an intentional step towards promoting and maintaining Assyrian identity and imperialism. Such cultural policies were promoted by a control over the west through a greater use of the provincial system. The risk of becoming an Assyrian vassal or a province was clearly present for Judah, with a provincial system leaving less freedom.⁴⁴⁴ Beyond an economic risk, there was a risk of becoming a citizen of the empire.⁴⁴⁵ The centre of the Assyrian empire was the “land of Aššur” and the people added to the land became its citizens. Various phrases were used for this, either as *nišē māt Aššur* or *Aššūrāyē*.⁴⁴⁶ The concern about the role of foreigners in the empire was also an area of debate for the empire, especially those foreigners who were used in the army.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴³ Paul Garelli, “Importance et rôle des Araméens dans l’administration de l’empire assyrien,” in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis I. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ed. H.J. Nissen and J. Renge; Berlin: Reimer, 1982), 437-47; Hayim Tadmor, “The Aramaization of Assyria: Aspects of Western Impact,” in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis I. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (ed. H.J. Nissen and J. Renge; Berlin: Reimer, 1982), 449-70; J. Nicholas Postgate, “Ancient Assyria-A Multi-Racial State,” *ARAM* 1 (1989): 1-10; Simo Parpola, “Assyrians after Assyria,” *JAAS* 12 (2000): 1-16.

⁴⁴⁴ Neo-Assyrian policy had a variety of options that were adopted for different circumstances. In cases of less extreme resistance, sometimes a vassal system was used. Clearly the HB and Israelite tradition were well aware of the vassal system and use it as a theological explanation for YHWH as a lawgiver. In addition, it is most likely this is what Ahaz adopted in order to keep some autonomy and Judahite identity. During the time of Neo-Assyrian presence in the Levant during Tiglath-Pileser III, it is clear that the vassal system was utilized. This is evident given the system imposed on the people of Urrudutu as stated in Nimrud letter ND 2713. 9-11; Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters*, 187-88.

⁴⁴⁵ Bustenay Oded, *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo Assyrian Empire* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979), 81-91.

⁴⁴⁶ See the discussion in Simo Parpola, “Assyrian Identify in Ancient Times and Today” n.p. Online: http://www.nineveh.com/parpola_eng.pdf. While these terms are not used in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III, there are various instances of his setting up the Assyrian deity in a conquered temple or annexing certain lands in the west and making them countries (Summ 9.13). The logical implication is that these people became *nišē māt Aššur* or *Aššūrāyē*.

⁴⁴⁷ A Nimrud letter dealing with conscripts in the west, relays a ransom being negotiated between two parties. The writer of the letter reports that one group refused the ransom, offering a reason that the conscripts are unreliable soldiers who would run away. Therefore, they should not be used as conscripts but should be killed: see ND 2680 Henry W.F. Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters*, 180-81. Many foreigners were taken as conscripts in the Assyrian army. It is likely that, if referring to soldiers, this text means foreign soldier who did not report back to Tiglath-Pileser. On the role of foreign soldiers in the Neo-Assyrian army

Part of Tiglath-pileser III's success involved an increased use of the provincial system over the vassal system, a greater obligation for the vassal to Assyria and a greater threat to the vassal who did not comply with the terms of the vassal agreement. We know that Ahaz submitted to the Assyrian yoke, thus increasing the reality of Assyrian presence for Judah but likely keeping the provincial model from overtaking Judah.⁴⁴⁸ Ahaz's submission suggests a real threat of the provincial system for Judah. That Tiglath-pileser III increased the practice of the provincial system is evident in the repeated phrase: *a-na mi-šir mat Aš-šur^{ki} ú-[tir]-ra* "I annexed to the country of Assyria".⁴⁴⁹ We know this phrase indicates placing the area under provincial control since this inscription clarifies who is placed in charge of the province: *a-na mi-šir mat Aš-šur^{ki} ú-[tir]-ra ina [muḥḥi pīhat] lu^{lu}abarakku ú-rad-di* "I annexed them to the province of Assyria (*mat Aš-šur^{ki}*) I added them to the province of the Chief Steward".⁴⁵⁰ The idea of a provincial system is also clear here from the term *pīhat*, which designated the provincial official in the NA period by the term *bēl pīḥāti*. Besides Ahaz's submission, the Judahite tradition around Jerusalem is concerned about Neo-Assyrian presence (Isa 7:18-20; 8:7). The prophetic tradition centered in Jerusalem corresponding to the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, recognized the same features of Assyrian rhetoric as the Psalms of YHWH's kingship,

and even elite units of foreign soldiers, see Stephanie Dalley, "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II," *Iraq* 47 (1985): 31-48. On the multi-ethnic make-up of the Neo-Assyrian empire, see J. Nicholas Postgate, "Ancient Assyria—A Multi-Racial State," *ARAM Periodical* 1(1989): 1-10.

⁴⁴⁸ We know the bribe was paid to Tiglath-pileser III for help against the Northern coalition (2 Kgs 16:8; 2 Chr 28:21). Ahaz goes to Damascus, the capital of an Assyrian province, to present this gift to the king (2 Kgs 16:10).

⁴⁴⁹ Summ 9.6, 13; Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 182.

⁴⁵⁰ Summ 9.13; Hayim Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 182. The reading of *[muḥḥi pīhat]* is preserved in Summ 9. 16.

and responded. The correspondence of the Psalms of YHWH's kingship with other Judahite texts of the same period will be further discussed later in this chapter.

How do the YHWH kingship Psalms respond to the cultural threats of the provincial system and the threat of becoming an Assyrian citizen? While the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are universal in their scope, in chapter 2, we also identified their constant concern for the people of Israel. In response to pro-Neo-Assyrian identity and the threat of citizenship, these Psalms preserve and promote Israelite identity and focus on the people of YHWH who, not only flock to YHWH, but belong to YHWH. The Psalms claim the people as YHWH's people: *באו נשתחוה ונכרעה נברכה לפני יייהוה* “come and let us bow down, let us kneel before YHWH who made us. Because He is our God and we are [his] people” (Ps 95:6-7). Similar phrases scattered throughout these Psalms emphasize the people of YHWH and Israelite identity.⁴⁵¹ The implication is that if YHWH's kingship is rooted in creation, and he made the people, then citizenship in the Assyrian empire is either not a possibility, or even if it occurs, meaningless.

The juxtaposition between the Assyrian universalistic rhetoric and citizenship compared to the Judahite focus on universalism and the people of Israel belonging to YHWH, implies a competition between YHWH's kingship and Neo-Assyrian kingship. In this context, the references to Israelite history and people in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, (Ps 95:7-9) combined with a universalistic YHWHism, are not contrary when

⁴⁵¹ While there is a universal perspective (Ps 96:7: “Give to the LORD, you families of nations”) the universalism of YHWH is tied to the identity of the people as YHWH's. The kingship of YHWH ensures a special promise for the Israelites. For example in Ps 97:10 we read, “YHWH loves those who hate evil, protects the lives of the faithful, rescues them from the hand of the wicked”; likewise in 98:3 “Has remembered faithful love toward the house of Israel”. Psalm 99:6 states “Moses and Aaron were among his priests, Samuel among those who called on God's name; they called on YHWH, who answered them.”

contextualized as responses to the Neo-Assyrian threat of becoming subsumed into the empire. Both the focus on YHWH's universal rule and the focus on the people of Israel and Jerusalem combat specific cultural elements of Assyrian rhetoric. YHWH's universalism competes with the new universalism of the Neo-Assyrian empire while the focus on YHWH's people preserves Israelite identity under the threat of an Assyrian provincial system.

Religious Policy

Tiglath-pileser III also brought a religious influence and threat for Judah. The nature of Assyrian religious influence in Judah is contested. Yet like all Neo-Assyrian policies that had a variety of forms and manifestations, each policy served the Assyrian desire to establish a universal rule. Thus, Assyrian universalism was so successful since it was matched with a flexibility of policy that was adapted to different circumstances. The variety of religiously motivated policies makes it difficult to discern exactly which policy was used in, or known by, Judah. The tendency in older scholarship was to focus on the more extreme policies, and to interpret them as a positive indication of religious influence in Judah. The scholarly response was to focus on our lack of knowledge of religious policy in Judah and on the reality that not all Neo-Assyrian religious policies in surrounding areas were extreme or even direct. The focus here is not to prove or disprove whether Neo-Assyrian religious expression was forced on Judah, an impossible task until new texts are discovered or made accessible. It is rather to ask whether the change in YHWH's kingship was a likely response to the religious policies we do know of. Focusing on the policies of Tiglath-pileser III in the Levant gives one possible way of contextualizing this response.

On the more direct end of Neo-Assyrian religious policy, was the practice of removing local cult statues and incorporating them into the Assyrian cult.⁴⁵² There are even instances of the Assyrians resituating the conquered god in an Assyrian style and returning that god to the home nation. In the methodological language of this study, Assyrian religious expression was translated to the target culture through the target culture's own deity.⁴⁵³ This last instance regards Neo-Assyrian and Babylonian relations under the reign of Assurbanipal in 668 BCE. While later than our target period, such tactics have root in the policies of Tiglath-pileser III since later Neo-Assyrian kings practiced such policies in the west. Holloway has gathered evidence of the Neo-Assyrian installation of the weapon of *Aššur* in various palaces.⁴⁵⁴

Tiglath-pileser's religious policies in the west demonstrate that Judah would have been aware of the religious threat, whether they experienced it directly or not. Summary Inscription 4 indicates that Tiglath-pileser III placed the statue of the gods in Gaza, the royal city of Hanunu, who escaped to Egypt after the Neo-Assyrian victory.⁴⁵⁵ The language here indicates that a statue and the image of Tiglath-pileser's kingship were both placed in the temple: [*ša-lam ilāni*^{meš} *rabūti*^{meš} *bēlē*^{meš}]-*ia ša-lam šarru-ti-ia* [*ša*

⁴⁵² See, for example, the following: Barbara N. Porter, "‘For the Astonishment of All Enemies’: Assyrian Propaganda and Its Audiences in the Reigns of Ashurnasirpal II and Esarhaddon," *BCSMS* 35 (2000): 7-18. Beate Pongratz-Leisten, "The Interplay of Military Strategy and Cultic Practice in Assyrian Politics," in *Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project* (ed. S. Parpola and R. M. Whiting; Helsinki, 1997), 245-52.

⁴⁵³ Marti Nissinen and Simo Parpola, "Marduk's Return and Reconciliation in a Prophetic Letter from Arbela," *SO* 99 (2004): 199-219.

⁴⁵⁴ This was a symbol of Assyrian power known as the *GIŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ kakki Aššur* "weapons of *Aššur*". It could have been the military standard and is featured in Assyrian royal inscriptions during the Neo-Assyrian period. It is used variously as a symbol of successful battle, as an object of purification, and the weapon given to the king by the god, to defeat the enemies of both. See RIMA 3. A.0.102.2 ii 72-73; RIMA 3 A.0.102.5 ii 4; RIMA 3. A.0.102.14: 28-29; RIMA 3 A.0.102.2 ii 96-97. For a discussion of these occurrences and evidence of Neo-Assyrian installation of this symbol in other conquered territories and its relation to oaths of loyalty from the conquered primarily during the time of Tiglath-pileser III, see Holloway, *Aššur in King! Aššur is King!*, 160-177.

⁴⁵⁵ (Summ 4. 10); Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 138. Summary Inscription 9.6 also discusses the royal image of Tiglath-Pileser being set up in the provinces.

hurāši ēpuš^{uš} i]-na qí-rib ekalli [ša^{URU} Ha-az-zu-tu ulziz a]-na ilāni māti-šu-nu am-nu-ma “The image of the great gods, my lords, and the image of my kingship I made of gold. In the palace of Gaza I set (them) up and counted (them) among the gods of their land”.⁴⁵⁶ Likewise, Summary inscription 9.14 specifies placing the image of the god and the image of Tiglath-pileser’s kingship in the palace.⁴⁵⁷ There is a possibility this included the weapon of Aššur. In some cases, the Assyrians built a palace and set up the weapon of Aššur in it.⁴⁵⁸ It is significant that the foreign palaces and temples of the west are being overtaken with images of Assyrian victory and religion. Whatever this image was, it is clear that the religious policies of Tiglath-pileser III in the west were at times forceful and, if known by Judah, would threaten YHWH’s kingship in its traditional form of the warrior king.

From the Nimrud letters, there is further evidence that Neo-Assyrian presence in the west could entail imposing its religious policies. These letters are particularly helpful since they are Neo-Assyrian communications and not the polemical genre of summary inscriptions or annals. While many of the Nimrud letters pertaining to the west are fragmentary, ND 2686 offers a clear account documenting the removal of the cult object and even an Assyrian debate on whether it should be removed or not.⁴⁵⁹ Holloway explains that, perhaps during the reign of Tiglath-pileser III, an Assyrian official is

⁴⁵⁶ My translation. The reference to “them” refers to both the image of kingship and to the god. This section is missing from Summ 4.10-11 and is reconstructed based on context and the extant line in Summ 8.16; Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 176. The context of that inscription is the same as Summ 8 and also addresses the situation in Gaza.

⁴⁵⁷ Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 188.

⁴⁵⁸ (Summ 7.44); Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 166. There is a possibility this may refer to the palace at home.

⁴⁵⁹ Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters*, 154.

halting the transportation of a cult statue from the Temple in Sidon, originally ordered for removal by another Assyrian official.⁴⁶⁰

While we cannot establish any specific Assyrian religious expression or cult that was forced onto Judah, other responses to the Assyrian threat outside the Psalms of YHWH's kingship provide some insight into what Judah knew of the Assyrian threat: in both the northern response in 2 Kgs 15:29-31 and the southern Judahite response in 2 Kgs 15:32-16:20, 2 Chr 27:1-28:27 and Isaiah 7. Competent historical reconstructions of this period have already been made.⁴⁶¹ If we accept those conclusions, in what ways, if any, do texts like the Judahite perspective in 2 Kgs 15:32-16:20, correspond with Neo-Assyrian religious rhetoric? Does this correspondence increase the likelihood of a shared context for the response in the YHWH kingship Psalms?

In the midst of the Northern coalition's attack on Jerusalem, Ahaz sends word to Tiglath-pileser III to save him from the Israelite attack. Judah therefore remained somewhat independent from at least the provincial system. In spite of Ahaz's political success for Judah, this Judahite textual tradition remembers the negative aspects of Ahaz's rule. Since the Assyrian threat to Judah was not directly military, the threat must lie elsewhere.

The possibility of Assyrian religious expression in Judah is heightened if the construction of the altar in Damascus and subsequently Jerusalem had Assyrian elements. In 2 Kgs 16:1-20, this Judahite version has Ahaz visiting Damascus to pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser III who saved him from the northern coalition. While there, Ahaz happens to see the altar in Damascus and gives his priest in Jerusalem detailed instructions on how

⁴⁶⁰ Holloway, *Aššur in King! Aššur is King*, 306. Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters*, 154-55.

⁴⁶¹ Dubovský, "Tiglath-pileser III's Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.," 153-70.

to re-construct this altar in Jerusalem. After instituting the new altar, the result is two altars: a large altar (the new one) for the sacrifice of the priests and a small altar (the old one) for the king's personal sacrifice, both set in the house of YHWH (2 Kgs 16:14-15).

It is unclear whether the Damascus altar is a northern Israelite design, or whether it had been adapted for Assyrian use by the time of Ahaz's visit.⁴⁶² McKay and Cogan rightly show Assyrian rule did not necessitate the worship of Assyrian gods.⁴⁶³ Yet in the context of imposed religious expressions in the other regions of the west, it is fair to ask how the potential threat of religious influence may have affected Judah. In this case, we have a biblical narrative that hints at Assyrian religious influence in a Judahite text that negatively represents the king who took on that religious influence. Despite arguing the altar is not of Assyrian origin, Cogan and Tadmor state: "the construction of this new altar of striking dimensions (the 'great altar' v. 15) should be viewed as motivated rather by a spirit of assimilation to the current international fashions".⁴⁶⁴ If Tadmor and Cogan are correct, we must ask what the motivation for building a new altar would be, in the context of a Judahite text communicating the problematic alliance between the Assyrian king and the Judahite king, if not an assimilation of the "international fashion" being instituted by Assyrian provinces.

A clue to the Assyrian influence, and a possible way to interpret the new altar, may be found in 2 Kgs 16:18:

⁴⁶² Some have called this an Assyrian altar see, Albert T. Olmstedt, *History of Assyria* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), 198. Others believe it is Aramaean based on 2 Kgs 5:18 see, Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings* (AYB 11; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 192.

⁴⁶³ Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.*, 42-64; John W. McKay, *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians* (SBTS 26; London: SCM Press, 1973), 60-66. Primarily Cogan and McKay argue that Assyrian imperial policy only established the cult in some of its provinces. Holloway offers a corrective to this position see, Steven W. Holloway, *Aššur in King! Aššur is King!: Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (CHANE 10; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

⁴⁶⁴ Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings*, 193.

וְאֶת־מִסְךְ [מוֹסַךְ] הַשַּׁבָּת אֲשֶׁר־בָּנוּ בְּבֵית וְאֶת־מִבּוֹא
הַמֶּלֶךְ הַחִיצוֹנָה הִסֵּב בֵּית יְהוָה מִפְּנֵי מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר:

The covered way of the Sabbath, which was built in the temple, and the outer entrance of the king that went around the temple of YHWH, he removed on account of the Assyrian king.⁴⁶⁵

It is clear that modifications to the house of YHWH are being made by Ahaz because of Tiglath-pileser III (מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר).⁴⁶⁶ It seems this text wants readers to conclude that the copied altar was of an Assyrian form. Perhaps because Assyrian policy did not force religious expression on regions that were not provinces, these Judahite authors have Ahaz voluntarily adopt an Assyrian altar to help articulate their argument. The point is not whether Assyria historically forced Assyrian religion on Judah in this text, but that Judah responded to a threat of foreign religious influence that was likely Assyrian. Under such conditions, the fear of influence could have been a sufficient catalyst for the re-expression of YHWH's kingship.

It seems that the most likely conclusion, historical or not, is that this Judahite text is representing the religious adoptions of Ahaz to appease the Assyrians. Whether this is adoption of a northern model or an Assyrian one is not the point, but that Ahaz chooses to install a form of an altar from a conquered Assyrian province. Since Assyria often established some form of Assyrian religion in its provinces, and Damascus was one of its provinces, the inferences of the text and the historical evidence at least open the possibility of Assyrian religious influence in Judah. The negative judgment of the narrative on Ahaz (2 Kgs 16:2-4) and the accusation of improper sacrifice against him, indicates that the narrative did not approve of the cultic practice and the altar, be it

⁴⁶⁵ The "removal" is the hiphil of סָבַב, the sense used in 1 Sam 5:10. The LXX agrees with this understanding ἐπέστρεψεν, the aorist of "to turn around, back."

⁴⁶⁶ This is the same in the LXX ἀπὸ προσώπου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.

Assyrian or otherwise. The Assyrian threat and Judahite response outside the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, combined with the type of religious expressions of this new imperialism that may have had influence on Judah, presents a tantalizing context through which to examine changes in YHWH's kingship localized in Judah and Jerusalem.⁴⁶⁷

Such practices would have been a threat to YHWHism. Assyrian religious practice occurred in the west, during the reign of the Neo-Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser III, at the likely date for the change in YHWH's kingship in the Psalms. Moreover, as 2 Kgs 16:1-20 makes clear, Judah interpreted and reflected on the threat that Assyrian influence imposed on its religious cult. In the light of Neo-Assyrian imperialism, any religious policy introduced into the west was one that YHWH the warrior king could not compete with. Merely the destruction of Israel to the north, and Ahaz's submission to Assyria, would have threatened the localized form of YHWH's warrior kingship conveyed in the early corpus. The Assyrians had their victory and this implied Aššur had his victory as well. A radical change to YHWH's kingship was required that would not place YHWH against Aššur when the army of the latter was the clear victor.

Universalism as Response

The rhetoric of universalism in the Neo-Assyrian empire was not lost on the Judahite community. The increased focus on a universalistic expression of the Israelite

⁴⁶⁷ These types of threats are repeated in the biblical narrative with later Assyrian kings like Sennacherib. One brief example of this threat, witnessed in Israelite tradition, is in 2 Kings 18. This text is consistent with the Assyrian strength in taking Samaria (2 Kings 18:10) and also reinforces the policy of deportation (2 Kings 18:11). Dubovský identifies various types of intelligence collection by the Assyrians that were a challenge to Israelite religious traditions. Dubovský shows that the theological response identified how Assyria misunderstood Israelite traditions and, according to the biblical tradition, had a blasphemous form of propaganda; see, Peter Dubovský, *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and its Significance for 2 Kings 18-19* (BibOr 49; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006), 262. Thus, the military and cultural presence of the Assyrians, and specifically the economic policy of deportation, motivated a theological response by the Israelites at least during the writing of 2 Kgs 18-19.

deity at the same time when the Neo-Assyrian Empire was threatening Judah with Assyrian universalism is no mere coincidence. In various ways YHWH's kingship in the Psalms addresses this imperialism. The universal creator king who holds absolute kingship allows for the Assyrian victory to occur and for YHWH to remain in control in spite of that victory. There is no better reason for Judah to express a universalistic creator king than in response to Assyrian imperialism.

The language of the Psalms demonstrates universalism by the people flocking to YHWH in worship. In a similar way, emissaries from all over the conquered world would flock to the Neo-Assyrian king. In ND 2759.10-25, there is a discussion between the Assyrian official and the king regarding visitors to the king. The king grants his permission for them to come. We get a sense that the word of the king, to welcome those to him, is important. In another Nimrud letter emissaries from Moab are spotted crossing the border without permission (ND 2762 9-19) and are eventually caught. The desire for emissaries to flock to the Assyrian king is clear: "let him come, and let Ashur, Shamash, Bel, and Nabu speak, that all these kings may wipe your sandals with their beards" (ND 2759 26-30).⁴⁶⁸ This is reminiscent of Jehu bowing down before Shalmaneser in the black obelisk and reinforces the universalism of Neo-Assyrian kingship where the nations come to Assyria and its kings.

Yet Assyrian universalism is rooted in battle, a feature of the early corpus of YHWH's warrior kingship that the form of kingship in the Psalms could no longer use effectively. In Summary inscription 11, Tiglath-pileser claims for himself the titles "the great king, the mighty king, king of the universe, king of Assyria, king of Babylon, king

⁴⁶⁸ Skaggs, ed., *The Nimrud Letters*, 190.

of Sumer and Akkad, king of the four quarters”.⁴⁶⁹ He even claims this is ordained by not only Aššur, but Shamash and Marduk as well. Since the proof for the success of Neo-Assyrian imperialism lay in success in battle, any war-like expression of YHWH’s kingship could not compete in light of Assyrian success.

The Absence of a Warrior Tradition as Response

In response, YHWH’s kingship is not rooted in the warrior kingship won in battle, but in the creator kingship that has universal control. As the analysis of the YHWH kingship Psalms in chapter 2 argued, the idea of the warrior deity is reduced to a point that there are only 3 clear references to it in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship. The language that one expects to represent the warrior tradition, like the hand of YHWH, is reversed in these Psalms. Thus, it is of little surprise that the image of Tiglath-pileser III is more like YHWH in the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts than in the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship. Like the hand imagery reversed in the Psalms, the waters also do not reinforce the warrior tradition as one would expect, but are associated with creation and praise for the creator king (Ps 93:3; 95:5; 96:11; 97:8).

YHWH’s control over the waters in Exod 15 demonstrate YHWH’s power, similarly, the waters are used to express Tiglath-pileser III’s power over Assyrian enemies. The image of the Assyrian armies, in particular Tiglath-pileser himself, is the “brave warrior, [*eṭlu qardu*] who with the help of Aššur his Lord [smashed like pots all the unsubmissive], swept over them like a flood [*a-bu-biṣ is-pu-nu-ma*] made them as powerless ghosts”.⁴⁷⁰ As in Exod 15, Tiglath-pileser III uses water imagery to demonstrate his power. In Ann 23.16 he boasts: “16 districts of Damascus I destroyed

⁴⁶⁹ Summ 11.1 Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 195. Tadmor’s translation.

⁴⁷⁰ Summ 7. 2; Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III* 159, Tadmor’s translation.

like mounds of ruins after the Deluge”.⁴⁷¹ The sense is clear as the image of the Deluge echoes a mythic background, thus the *abūbum* = A.MA.RU that overwhelmed (*sapānum*) the Assyrian enemies is akin to the power of Tiglath-pileser III.

The task of YHWH’s kingship Psalms was not to set YHWH against or in competition with *Aššur*, Tiglath-pileser III, or any other Neo-Assyrian king.

The inscriptions of these kings demonstrate a specific imperialistic polemic that their rule extended to the entire known world. In the absence of a strong Israelite king, army, or effective coalition, to combat this new form of Assyrian imperialism a warrior deity was no longer a sufficient metaphor. The warrior tradition could have traction in earlier forms of expanding tribes in the Levant, but the new international stage called for a new expression. The genius of the theological shift in YHWH’s kingship is that it competes with the new universalistic vision of the Neo-Assyrian empire, but situates the strength of that universalism in creation to which all things relate. In this way, the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship recover aspects of the Babylonian tradition to subvert Neo-Assyrian rhetoric and practice of world domination.

Part IV: Jerusalemite Prophets of the Neo-Assyrian Period

There is more than one set of texts that demonstrate that Neo-Assyrian imperialism begun under Tiglath-pileser III motivated change in YHWH’s kingship, namely eighth-century texts like Isaiah.⁴⁷² This prophet was responding to the same

⁴⁷¹ Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 80

⁴⁷² Indeed, recent scholarship has focused on the effect of Neo-Assyrian dominance on the eighth-century prophets. Pinḥas Artzi, “‘All Nations and Many Peoples’: The Answer of Isaiah and Micah to Assyrian Imperial Policies,” in *Treasures on Camels’ Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph’al* (ed. M. Cogan and D. Kahn; Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2008), 41-53; also see Moshe Weinfeld, “The Protest against Imperialism in Ancient Israelite Prophecy,” *The Origin and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations* (ed. S.N. Eisenstadt; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983), 169-82. Baruch A. Levine, “Ah Assyria? My Rage’ (Isa 10:15):

Assyrian policies, in the same location, and at the same time that this study situates the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. A study of Isaiah's response to Assyrian imperialism helps solidify the date and context of these Psalms as a reaction to Neo-Assyrian imperialism in the Judahite community of the 8th century.⁴⁷³ The task then, is to look to the prophetic tradition for the re-expression of YHWH's kingship similar to the type in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. The advantage of this comparison is contextualizing the change in YHWH's kingship as a response to Neo-Assyria from a separate and independent vantage point.

First-Isaiah

First-Isaiah was well aware of Assyrian presence and responded in a way theologically appropriate for Judah and Jerusalem as the cultic centre. He criticized various Assyrian policies like their violence against nations (Isa 10:7; 14:7; 33:8; 37:13). In particular, Isa 10 is a protest against Assyria for its crimes (10:5-15) and the destruction Assyria caused (Isa 10:16-34). In response to Assyria, Isa 11 describes the rise of Israel's divine ruler who would institute peace and world salvation (11:1-10).⁴⁷⁴ Therefore, First-Isaiah is directly attacking the same Assyrian imperialism to which the

Biblical Monotheism as seen in an International Political Perspective," *Eretz-Israel* 27 (2003): 136-42. Levine has spent more attention and time on the cult of *Aššur* as the source of the response. This was done in a similar way in Baruch A. Levine, "Assyrian Ideology and Israelite Monotheism," *Iraq* 67 (2005): 411-427. Formational for this area of investigation has been Peter Machinist, "Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah," *JAOS* 103 (1983): 719-37. In general, various biblical passages correspond to the reign of Tiglath-pileser III: 2 Kgs 15-16; 1 Chr 5:6, 26; 2 Chr 28:16-21; Amos 6:2 and Isa 7; 8:1-10, 23; 10:9; 17:1-3.

⁴⁷³ The theological view of YHWH's divinity could be compared to biblical traditions that had their origins in Judah. Mark W. Hamilton, "The Past as Destiny: Historical Visions in Sam'al and Judah under Assyrian Hegemony," *HTR* 91 (1998): 215-50. has reflected on the role of the DtrH as a reaction to Sargon's presence in the Levant.

⁴⁷⁴ Weinfeld, "The Protest against Imperialism in Ancient Israelite Prophecy," 170. Weinfeld adds that a change occurred in Israelite prophecy in which nations were no longer demonized by the prophetic corpus for their acts against Israel, but were chastised by the prophets for their imperialistic strategies. Weinfeld demonstrates this through a comparison of Nahum and Habakkuk with First-Isaiah. Therefore, reactions to imperialism are a central feature to the prophets of this period.

changes in YHWH's kingship, from a warrior king to a creator king, were also responding.⁴⁷⁵

Universalism

First-Isaiah was aware of Neo-Assyrian universalism and its threat to Judah. In response to this universalism, like the Psalms, YHWH is placed in control of the whole world and intends to use Assyria to punish Israel (Isa 10:6-8). YHWH also warns that any intentions Assyria might have that stretch beyond how YHWH will use Assyria will not be possible: והוא לא ידמה ולא יבבו לא יחשב כי להשמיד בלבבו ולהכרית גוים לא מעט “he [Assyria] does not intend [this], nor in his heart thinks it, rather, in his heart is to destroy and to cut off not a few nations,” (Isa 10:7). First-Isaiah and the Judahites in Jerusalem knew about Assyria's universal ambitions and knew they could not defeat Assyria. Similar to the Psalms, Isaiah responds by still preserving his community and reflecting on the nature of YHWH's divinity for his context.

Machinist draws various parallels between First-Isaiah's understanding of Assyrian presence and Assyrian inscriptions to show First-Isaiah was uniquely informed

⁴⁷⁵ When studying First-Isaiah and looking for correspondence between his work and the Neo-Assyrian material, it is difficult to date the biblical text with the specific Neo-Assyrian king being intended. The dating of the passages studied below has not changed much since Machinist's study, “Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah,” 722. He suggested the following dates for the relevant passages of First-Isaiah: 734-733 B.C. for Isaiah 7-8; 716 B.C. for Isaiah 14:28-31; 19:23-24; 712 BCE for Isaiah 20:1-6 and 701 BCE for Isaiah 36-39/2 Kings 18-20. Machinist believes a poem like Isa 10 responds to the military campaign (under Sennacherib) that attacked Jerusalem and Judah in 701 BCE. He reasons that Isa 10:11 is aware of the conquest of Samaria in the north, but represents the threat to Jerusalem as a present challenge. Peter Machinist, “Final Response: On the Study of the Ancients, Language, Writing and the State,” in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Culture* (ed. Seth Sanders; The OIS 2; Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 2006), 297. Despite the attack on Jerusalem that took place under Sennacherib, as discussed above, the threat to Jerusalem was already felt under the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III (744-727 BCE) reflected in the actions of Ahaz.

The response to Assyrian imperialism in Judah cannot be reduced to one king. Between the time that Tiglath-pileser III introduced the new form of Neo-Assyrian imperialism, there are still the reigns of Shalmaneser V (726-722 BCE) and Sargon II (721-705 BCE), before the attack on Jerusalem by Sennacherib. The Judahite response, both in its Psalmic and prophetic forms, is not presented as a response to a singular king, but to the whole Neo-Assyrian project began under Tiglath-Pileser III. Thus, we look at the responses of First-Isaiah for correspondences with the theology of YHWH's kingship in the Psalms, and perhaps the latter as a basis for the former.

by and possessed accurate knowledge of Neo-Assyrian rhetoric. One example is Isa 10:13.⁴⁷⁶ While the language in v. 13 parallels the language of Tiglath-pileser III as argued by Machinist, the language in v. 14 also parallels the solution of the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. In Isaiah, the Assyrian king claims *כל־הארץ אני אספתי* "I myself gathered all the earth". Instead of the Assyrian king gathering *כל־הארץ*, the YHWH kingship Psalms claim this rule for YHWH (Pss 96:9, 13; 97:1; 97:9; 98:3b). While First-Isaiah and these Psalms both reinforce YHWH's universalism, the former has a different reaction than the Psalms. First-Isaiah argues that YHWH removes his holiness and turns it to a fire (10:17) compared to the Psalms of YHWH's kingship that lack such violence.

Isaiah 10:5-11 is another example of Isaiah's response and corresponds with the Psalms' similar response.⁴⁷⁷ Like the Psalms of YHWH's kingship that avoid placing YHWH against Assyria, Isaiah admits the power of the Assyrians (Isa 10:8-11) and Machinist shows that control over Assyrian power is placed in the hand of YHWH (Isa 10:5, 12, 15). Thus, the vision of universalism (including YHWH's control over the other nations) is shared in First-Isaiah and in the Psalms.

First-Isaiah's universalism also articulates the importance of YHWH as creator that the Psalms of YHWH's kingship also express. YHWH can do these things because creation is YHWH's to control: *וכבוד יערו וכרמלו מנפש ועד־בשר יכלה והיה כמסס נסס*, "his glorious forest and his fertile field will be finished and melt as a sickness from soul until flesh" (Isa 10:18). Both the universalism of YHWH's kingship and the universalism rooted in creation, essential elements for the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, are presumed

⁴⁷⁶ Machinist, "Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah," 725. Machinist compares this to a passage from Tiglath-pileser III: "[The city) Sarraba]ni (and the) Bit-Sa'alli I uprooted to their very limits . . . These lads I restored to the border of Assyria" (Machinist's translation). Machinist also notes that while similar language occurs in other places in the Bible, only here does it involve the imperialism of Assyria.

⁴⁷⁷ Machinist, "Final Response," 297.

in the theology of First-Isaiah. Furthermore, like the Psalms of YHWH's kingship that focus on the people of Israel (Ps 95:1-2; 6-11; 96: 7, 13; 97:8, 10, 12; 98:9; 99:3), First-Isaiah focuses on the remnant (Isa 10:21-24; 11:11-12). While the Psalm's are a more hopeful vision of the people's role, the change towards universalism in First-Isaiah must be tempered by reinforcing Israelite identity. Under the threat of Assyrian cultural influence and becoming a citizen of the empire, both the Psalms and First-Isaiah combated this with a universal deity that did not compromise Israelite cultural identity, but preserved it.

A final correspondence between First-Isaiah and the Psalms in their articulation of YHWH's kingship is in Isa 11. Here the prophet describes the ideal human king. Since the features of the ideal human king and divine kingship are related (here this is stated in Isa 11:1) when the human king operates properly, the nature of YHWH's rule is reflected in the human king.⁴⁷⁸ Compared to the classical Israelite image of the warrior king, First-Isaiah evokes a peaceful image of kingship. Elements like universal rule are present (Isa 11:9b) as they are in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. Likewise, Isaiah's human king is a judge (Isa 11:4-5). In Ps 96:10: יהוה מלך אֶפְתָּחֹן תָּבֵל בַּל־תִּמּוֹט יֵדִין עַמִּים בְּמִישְׁרִים

“YHWH is king, really the world is fixed and will not be shaken. He judges the people with uprightness”.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁸ The relationship between the human king and YHWH is evident in the human king's anointing, David's participation in the liturgy (2 Sam 6), and Solomon's role in the cult (1 Kgs 8). Further, like Pss 2, 21 and 72 show the king as mediator of the divine spirit. The spirit of YHWH resting on the human king is not only a sign of divine approval, but the human king reflects the ideal features of kingship as presented by the divine king. This is apparent in the discussion of *melammu* above, which can be a feature of both the divine and the human king. For further discussion about the nature of this relationship in the Psalms, see John H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms*, 135-195.

⁴⁷⁹ This is also repeated in the Psalm: “For he comes to judge the earth, he judges the world with righteousness and the people with his truth” (Ps 96:13). This theme of YHWH's judgment is in Pss 93:5; 97:2; 97:10; 98:9; 97:11; 99:4; 99:7; 99:8.

First-Isaiah was not only aware of Assyrian policy, but that Assyrian presence was a significant enough threat for Judah that First-Isaiah gives particular attention to it. In particular, First-Isaiah responds to Assyrian imperialism in a similar way to the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, in a shared geographical and chronological context. The comparison with First-Isaiah demonstrates that the Psalms of YHWH's kingship are well situated in a Judean and Jerusalemite context in response to Assyrian imperialism.

The Warrior Tradition

There are also differences between First-Isaiah and the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. While the writers of each corpus both express the universalism of YHWH in response to Assyrian imperialism, they differ in their use of the warrior tradition. In many ways, the warrior language of First-Isaiah is not as prevalent as in the early corpus of YHWH kingship texts. That said, warrior language is more prevalent in First-Isaiah than in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, but both still invert the YHWH warrior imagery present in earlier Israelite texts.

For example, as the hand of YHWH becomes a source of his creation in the Psalms, in Isa 11:4b, the rod, the traditional symbol of the warrior god becomes a metaphor for the divine king's word: *והכה ארץ בשבט פיו וברוח שפתיו מית רשע* "he will strike the earth with the rod of his mouth and with the breath of his lips he will make the wicked perish". In this metaphor, a literal death is not the message. Rather, the rod of the mouth will cause evil to cease. The metaphorical death of sin is clarified in the literary context (Isa 11:6-8), which is the famous passage of the wolf dwelling with the lamb.

First-Isaiah still uses the image of YHWH the warrior, yet demonstrates how YHWH as warrior is different than Isaiah's presentation of the Assyrian king as warrior.

For Isaiah the Assyrian king is a warrior of destruction (Isa 14:17-18), while YHWH's war is to bring about peace. Weinfeld notes that there are six accusations of Isaiah against the Assyrian king and all are based on the destructive nature of the Assyrians.⁴⁸⁰ In the formulation of YHWH's kingship to combat Assyrian imperialism, it would be problematic for Isaiah's construction of YHWH the warrior to be similar to the accusations of Isaiah against the Assyrian king's destructive power. Like the Psalms, First-Isaiah realizes that setting YHWH directly against Aššur or the Neo-Assyrian kings was not a viable option.⁴⁸¹ First-Isaiah's knowledge of Neo-Assyrian military pressure was a likely crux for any articulation of YHWH's divinity.⁴⁸² First-Isaiah's solution is ingenious but different than Psalms of YHWH's kingship. The image of peace in Isa 11:6-8 is qualified. The peace being spoken is limited to Jerusalem:

לֹא יָבִיאוּ רָעָה וְלֹא יִשְׁחָדוּ בְּכָל הָהָר קְדְשִׁי “They will not bring about evil and will not bring about corruption in all my holy mountain” (Isa 11:9). Unlike the Psalms, any universalistic kingship Isaiah describes does not mean that peace extends beyond Jerusalem. Isaiah retains the warrior nature of YHWH to fight Jerusalem's enemies.

While there will be peace in Jerusalem and peace between Israel in the north and Judah in the south (Isa 11:13), Israelites will join together to plunder (בָּזַז) the surrounding nations. Thus, the actions of the people are reflected in the actions of YHWH who will also use the power of his hand (יָדוֹ) to destroy the watercourses of the Nile and

⁴⁸⁰ They are removing boundaries, plundering, exile, wiping out nations, degradation of the leader and destruction: Weinfeld, “The Protest against Imperialism in Ancient Israelite Prophecy,” 172.

⁴⁸¹ Machinist emphasizes that various passage of First-Isaiah indicate there is little hope of a military response to Assyrian pressure. Of Isa 5:26b-27a; 5:28; 10:6b; 13b Machinist says: “In such verses, one will note, the invincibility of the Assyrian army is taken for granted. Hardly any real thought is given to a plan of military defense;” see Machinist, “Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah,” 722.

⁴⁸² Machinist draws attention to several parallels, all of which deal with the military nature of the Neo-Assyrian army. See Machinist, “Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah,” 724-26.

the Euphrates (Isa 11:15). This is similar to the water being brought over Israel in Isaiah 8:7-8. First-Isaiah does not mute the warrior tradition, but shifts it in a direction that acknowledges YHWH's universal rule. Rather than staking YHWH's actions of war directly against the contemporary military action of the Assyrian empire, YHWH controls the military action of the empire (Isa 10:5) and utilizes his warrior nature to keep Assyria from complete domination and to ensure the return of Israel to a peaceful Jerusalem (Isa 11).

Comparing the image of the water in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship, First-Isaiah, and Neo-Assyrian sources, demonstrates that the Judahite traditions around Jerusalem (Psalms and First-Isaiah) are responding to Neo-Assyrian imperialism with a universal idea of YHWH's kingship, and developing earlier forms of YHWH's kingship in their own ways. Machinist has again demonstrated parallels between Isa 8:7-8 and Neo-Assyrian rhetoric, citing examples from Esharhaddon and Sennacherib.⁴⁸³ Yet notably, the language also has parallel with, and is likely a precursor for the language of other Neo-Assyrian kings, in the language of Tiglath-pileser III. In Ann 23.16 "16 districts of Damascus I destroyed like mounds of ruins after the Deluge".⁴⁸⁴ The image of the Assyrian armies, in particular Tiglath-pileser himself, is the "brave warrior, [*eṭlu qar-*

⁴⁸³ Of Esarhaddon, Machinist cites *ša tallaktašu abūbumma* "Whose gait is the flood" and of Sennacherib: *pulḥi melamme bēlūtiya išḥupūšuma* "The terrifying radiance of my majesty overwhelmed him." See Machinist, "Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah," 726.

ולכן הנה אדני מעלה עליהם את־מי הנהר העצומים והרבים את־מלך אשור ואת־כל־כבודו ועלה על־כל־אפיקיו והלך על־כל־גדותיו: וחלף ביהודה שטף ועבר עד־צואר יגיע והיה מטות כנפיו מלא רחב־ארצך עמנו אל	‘And so, look now, the Lord is brining upon them the waters of the River, mighty and numerous, (namely), the king of Assyria and all his glory, and he shall run over all his courses, and go over all his banks. And he will push on against Judah, overflow and sweep over, reaching even the neck. And his outspread wings will fill the breadth of your land, O Immanuel (Isa 8:7-8, Machinist’s translation).
--	---

⁴⁸⁴ Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 80.

du] who with the help of *Aššur* his Lord [smashed like pots all the unsubmissive] swept over them like a flood [*a-bu-biš is-pu-nu-ma*] made them as powerless ghosts” (Summ 7. 2).⁴⁸⁵

Comparatively, the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship utilize water imagery to subvert the warrior tradition more than First-Isaiah and root the universal kingship of YHWH in the creator tradition. In Ps 93:3-4 the Psalmist speaks of YHWH raising up the rivers (נהרות), but does not communicate what the purpose of raising the rivers. It is not for destroying enemies as with the image used by Tiglath-pileser. Rather, in the context of the Psalm, the only function of the waters is to demonstrate YHWH’s kingship, void of the warrior language. This is made clear in Ps 95. The function of the sea is not related to some echo of a mythological battle, but it simply *אֲשֶׁר־לֹ הַיָּם* “belongs to YHWH”, along with the mountains, the earth, and the dry land, because YHWH created them (Ps 95:4-5).⁴⁸⁶ Unlike the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship that intentionally move away from the warrior tradition, First-Isaiah uses that warrior tradition differently than the early YHWH kingship corpus but proper to the context of a Neo-Assyrian threat. Despite this, First-Isaiah and the Psalms of YHWH’s kingship share a similar vision of YHWH and both respond to Neo-Assyrian imperialism, in Judah, begun under the reign of Tiglath-pileser III. The correspondence between First-Isaiah and these Psalms solidifies the Jerusalemite context for the shift in YHWH’s kingship during the 8th century, but their differences also highlight the unique vision of the Psalm’s construction of kingship.

⁴⁸⁵ Tadmor, *The Inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III*, 159. (Tadmor’s translation).

⁴⁸⁶ In this Psalm, the reference to Meribah and Massah recalls the image of YHWH bringing water forth from the rock to satisfy his people (Exod 17:6). Here again, water functions not in connection to the mythological tradition of YHWH’s battle with the sea, but only to YHWH’s control over nature.

Summary

This chapter has built upon the analysis of YHWH in chapter 2 and of Marduk in chapter 4, and argued that the degree of correspondence between them is sufficient enough to suggest that the nature of YHWH's kingship as expressed in Pss 93; 95-99 is analogous to that of Marduk in the *Enūma eliš*. The analogous parallel development of these deities is due to their similar histories, histories that attract to themselves multiple traditions. Marduk is thus a suitable prototype for YHWH's re-expression. As a result, YHWH's divinity, like that of Marduk, expresses a universal and absolute kingship rooted in their respective creational roles. They share similar divine natures as well as a focus on the divine word that solidifies universal kingship. Yet differ in their use of divine warrior language. The warrior tradition is celebrated in the *Enūma eliš* but that tradition is subdued in Psalms of YHWH's kingship for the needs of a community that is not able to respond with effective military action.

This chapter has also identified the context from which the Psalms of YHWH's kingship reflected this new form of YHWH's kingship. Through a study of Neo-Assyrian rhetorical strategies of imperialism in the Levant, guided by the policies of Tiglath-pileser III, the new features of YHWH's kingship are responses to the type of Neo-Assyrian imperialism evident in the economic, cultural and religious policies of Tiglath-pileser III. Similar responses against that imperialism by First-Isaiah corroborated our claim that YHWH's kingship as conveyed in the YHWH malak Psalms were a response to Assyrian imperialism. A fuller study could be made of other prophetic Judahite texts of

the same time and their correspondence with the type of divinity presented in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁷ The organization and editorial history of Micah is a complex matter, but there is some agreement that chapters 1-3 are early, perhaps belonging to Micah himself, while chapters 4-5 are later, dealing with themes of exile, leaving chapters 6-7 very difficult to identify; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 92. The texts that concern us are those that scholars working in this area have used to discuss the 8th century Jerusalemite prophetic response to Neo-Assyrian presence. Artzi identifies Micah 4:1d-2:

וְנָהָרוּ עָלָיו עַמִּים: Mic 4:2 וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ לָבוֹ וְנַעֲלֶה
אֶל-הַר-יְהוָה וְאֶל-בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וְיִזְכְּנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו וְנִלְכֶּה בְּאַרְחֵתָיו כִּי
מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תּוֹרָה וּדְבַר-יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם:

Artzi's translation make the connections clearer: "And peoples will come streaming to it; and many nations shall go and say: 'Come, let us go to the Mount of YHWH, to the House of the God of Jacob, that He may instruct us in His ways and that we may walk in His path; for instruction shall come forth from Zion and the word of YHWH from Jerusalem.'" See, Artzi, "All Nations and Many Peoples': The Answer of Isaiah and Micah to Assyrian Imperial Policies," in *Treasures on Camels' Humps*, 43.

The first question is whether this passage can be attributed to the 8th century part of the prophecy. This issue is far less clear than in parts of First-Isaiah. With this in mind, we see that many of the themes of this prophet speaking against Assyrian imperialism are present in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship. First the universalism of YHWH is on the mind of this author. YHWH is in control; thus no matter what happens regarding an Assyrian victory, it is not Aššur defeating YHWH. Furthermore, as we saw in Marduk and YHWH, there is a focus on the eternal word of YHWH. Finally, again we see the absence of the warrior tradition.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

This study has identified at least two distinct stages of YHWH's kingship and has articulated the distinct features of YHWH's kingship at each stage. As well, this study has argued for a probable context in which the change to YHWH's kingship took place and identified the motivations for why such change occurred.

Chapter one identified a dominant scholarly assumption, influenced by Mowinckel, that constructed all expressions of YHWH's kingship in the HB by collapsing the warrior king and the universal creator-king into a singular and consistent expression of YHWH's kingship in the entire HB. To begin separating the expressions of YHWH's kingship, that chapter described the Canaanite context from which YHWH's early warrior kingship developed. Charting how the Psalms of YHWH's kingship differed in their language from both YHWH's kingship in the Song of the Sea and Baal's kingship in the Baal Cycle established a divergence in the Israelite visions of YHWH's kingship and set the basis for this study to account for that divergence.

Chapter two established at least two distinct stages of YHWH's kingship: the later Jerusalemite corpus of a universal-creator king in Pss 93, 95-99 and the earlier corpus of a warrior king with a limited kingship in Exod 15:1-18, Deut 33:5, Num 23:21 and Ps 29. That chapter also discovered that while the Psalms of YHWH's kingship echo parts of the early tradition, they are mostly silent on YHWH the warrior who wins kingship through battle to protect a small group. Rather, Pss 93, 95-99 intentionally move beyond the warrior tradition and gather all expressions of divinity under YHWH the creator whose kingship is both uncontested and has universal effects. By comparing Ps 29 with Ps 96,

chapter two solidified the differences between the early stage and later stage of YHWH's kingship.

To account for the change from the earlier stage to the later stage of YHWH's kingship, a method was required that addressed two issues particular to assessing change in YHWH's kingship; a method that illuminated what influenced changes in religious expressions and one that was also open to the possibility of ANE influences in the formulation of those changes. Therefore, cultural translation (CT) addressed how ideas are translated between cultures, offered approaches and specific nomenclature to understand both the source and the target cultures, and highlighted the importance of understanding motivations for moments of CT. Chapter 3 thus resituated CT in its anthropological roots and summarized recent developments in CT within anthropology. This led to a more accurate understanding of CT so it could be used for the study of YHWH's kingship.

CT importantly asked about coherence: to understand the expression in the source culture before understanding why it was translated to the target culture. Chapter 4 established that Marduk's kingship was unique in the ANE. His kingship was the first time that one creator king was given absolute power over the gods. Further, this chapter explored the origins of Marduk's kingship and found that the change in Marduk's kingship was likely motivated by a Babylonian response to an early form of Assyrian imperialism under Tukulti-Ninurta I rather than under Kassite rule. By exploring the motivations for and coherence of Marduk's kingship, the analysis of chapter 4 became an ideal historical analogue to illuminate the change in YHWH's kingship. The remainder of

the study explored the similarities and differences between YHWH and Marduk and argued for the ideal context from which change to YHWH's kingship occurred.

Thus chapter 5 argued for the context from which YHWH's warrior kingship was changed to a universal creator king. Neo-Assyrian economic, cultural and religious pressures in the Levant were the most likely catalyst for change to YHWH's kingship. By studying the foreign policy of Tiglath-pileser III, this chapter showed how the changes in YHWH's kingship were likely responses to Neo-Assyrian imperialism. The Jerusalemite community's response to Neo-Assyrian presence was corroborated by the similar Judahite prophet's response against that same imperialism.

In addition chapter 5 speculated about whether Marduk was a reasonable CT from Babylon to Israel. That moment of translation cannot be proven and remains only a possibility. It is equally possible that under similar historical conditions, Israelite scribes, ignorant of Marduk's kingship, elevated YHWH to an absolute creator king. Therefore, similar external pressures on Babylon and Israel under Assyrian rule led to Judah formulating a similar response with the Babylonian one.

That possibility admitted, chapter 4 brought attention to the wide distribution of the *Enūma Eliš* throughout the Mesopotamian world. Then chapter 5 showed that Marduk and YHWH experienced parallel histories and rose to prominence under similar circumstances. Whether or not Israelite scribes knew of Marduk's early history, the similar circumstances surrounding Marduk's rise would have made Marduk an ideal candidate for the Israelites seeking to express a new form of YHWH's kingship. As chapter 4 made clear Marduk's kingship was unique in the ANE. It is important to note that the Babylonians' articulation of Marduk as a universal creator-king with absolute

power has no other equal expression in the ANE until the kingship of YHWH in the Psalms of YHWH's kingship.

While chapter 5 argued that Marduk's kingship is a viable CT from Babylon to Israel for the new expression of YHWH's kingship, the thesis for change in YHWH's kingship and the motivations for that change do not rely on whether Marduk's kingship was translated to Israel. Whether or not Marduk's kingship was a CT to help express YHWH's new kingship, the methodological approach of CT helped this study achieve many other results: CT helped formulate questions around the motivations for changes to kingship, it invited a deeper understanding for the reasons of growth in Marduk's kingship, and therefore it offered an illuminating historical analogue to articulate the changes to YHWH's kingship in Israel.

This study has established two distinct stages of YHWH's kingship: the early stage (Exod 15:1-18, Deut 33:5, Num 23:21 and Ps 29) that presents a warrior king with a limited kingship similar to Canaanite kingships like Baal's, and the later stage (Pss 93, 95-99) that forwards a universal, creator and absolute king set in a Jerusalemite context relatively unique in the ANE. In response to Neo-Assyrian imperialism, made tangible in the foreign policy of Tiglath-pileser III, Israelite scribes changed YHWH's kingship from one stage of kingship to the next. First, CT illuminated a relevant historical analogue from Babylon to understand the motivation for change to YHWH's kingship in Israel. Second, CT opened the possibility that Marduk's divinity in the *Enūma Eliš* was a reasonable cultural translation to Israel. Israelite scribes may have used Marduk's divinity to express their new vision of YHWH's kingship.

Bibliography

- Abusch, Tzvi. "Marduk." Pages 547-548 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons*. Second edition; Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ahituv, Shmuel. "Did God Really Have a Wife?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 32 (2006): 62-66.
- Ahituv, Shmuel. *Canaanite Toponyms in Ancient Egyptian Documents*. Jerusalem: Magnes; Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Albright, William F. *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan: An Historical Analysis of Two Conflicting Faiths*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- Albright, William F. "Oracles of Balaam." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 207-33.
- Andreski, Stanoslav. *Max Weber's Insights and Errors*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Amar, Annus and Alan Lenzi. *Ludlul Bēl Nēmeqi: The Standard Babylonian Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*. State Archives of Assyria Volume VII. Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2010.
- Arnold, Bill T. *Who Were the Babylonians?* Archaeology and Biblical Studies 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Artzi, Pinḥas. "'All Nations and Many Peoples': The Answer of Isaiah and Micah to Assyrian Imperial Policies." Pages 41-53 in *Treasures on Camels Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph'al*. Edited by M. Cogan and D. Kahn. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2008.
- Asad, Talal. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology." Pages 171-199 in *Genealogies of Religion: Disciplines and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Edited by T. Asad. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1993.
- Assmann, Jan. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Aster, Shawn Z. "The Phenomenon of Divine and Human Radiance in the Hebrew Bible

- and in Northwest Semitic and Mesopotamian Literature: A Philological and Comparative Study.” PhD. Diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2006.
- Axelsson, Lars E. *The Lord Rose Up From Seir: Studies in the History and Traditions of the Negev and Southern Judah*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 25. Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987.
- Batto, Bernard F. “Creation Theology in Genesis.” Pages 16-38 in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. Edited by R. J. Clifford and J. J. Collins. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 24. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992.
- Baumgartner, Joseph M., Esther G. Chazon, Avital Pinnick eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. “World Hegemony, 900-300 BCE.” Pages 48-62 in *A Companion to the Ancient Near East*. Edited by D. C. Snell. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. “Mesopotamia.” Pages 165-172 in *Ancient Religions*. Edited by S. I. Johnston. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Beck, Pirhiya. “The Drawings from Horvat Teiman (Kuntillet ‘Ajrud).” *Tel Aviv* 9 (1982): 3-68.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. ed., *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. “Deuteronomistic Redaction In/Among ‘The Twelve’? A Contribution from the Standpoint of the Books of Micah, Zephaniah and Obadiah.” Pages 232-61 in *Those Elusive Deuteronomists: the Phenomena of Pan-Deuteronomism*. Edited by L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *A History of Prophecy in Israel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Bloch, Yigal. “The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I.” *Orientalia* 79.1 (2010): 1-35.
- Boissier, Alfred. “Document Cassite.” *Revue d’Assyriologie et d’Archéologie Orientale* 39 (1932): 93-104.
- Botha, Philippus J. “The ‘Enthronement Psalms’: A Claim to the World-wide Honour of

- Yahweh.” *Old Testament Essays* 11 (1998): 24-39.
- Bottéro, Jean. *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Translation of *La plus vieille religion: en Mésopotamie*. Éditions Gallimard, 1998. Translated by Teresa Lavender Fagan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Brenner, Marc L. *The Song of the Sea: Exodus 15.1-21*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 195. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1991.
- Brettler, Marc Z. *God is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 76. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Brinkman, John A. *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia: 1158-722 B.C.* Analecta Orientalia 43. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1968.
- Brinkman, John A. *A Catalogue of Cuneiform Source Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty*. Materials and Studies For Kassite History 1. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1976.
- Brinkman, John A. and D. Matthews, “A Grandson of Kuriglazu.” *Notes Assyriologiques Breves et Utiles* (1990).
- Broyles, Craig C. *Psalms*. New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Budge E. A. W. and L. W. King, *The Annals of the Kings of Assyria: The Cuneiform Texts with Translations, Transliterations from the Original Documents in the British Museum*. Volume 1. Londres: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1902.
- Buber, Martin. *The Kingship of God*. New York: Harper and Row, 1967. Translated by Richard Scheimann. Translation of *Königtum Gottes*. Berlin: Schocken, 1936.
- Cagiran, G. and Wilfred G. Lambert, “The Late Babylonian Kislimu Ritual for Esagil.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 43-45 (1991-1993): 89-106.
- Cancik-Kirschbaum, E.C. *Die mittelassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šeḥ Ḥamad*. Berichte der Ausgrabung Tall Šeḥ Ḥamad/Dūr Katlimmu 4. Berlin; 1996.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Cassin, Elena. *La splendeur divine: Introduction à l'étude de la mentalité mésopotamienne*. Sorbonne: Paris Mouton & Co., 1968.

- Chambers, Claire. "Anthropology as Cultural Translation: Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*." *Postcolonial Text* 2.3 (2006): 1-19.
- Chambers, Claire. "History as Fiction, Fiction as History: Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*." Pages 51-91 in *The Fiction of Amitav Ghosh: An Assessment*. Edited by O.P. Dwivedi. Jaipur, Rajasthan: Book Enclave, 2009.
- Childs, Brevard. *Exodus*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Clay, Albert T. *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania: Series A Cuneiform Texts XIV*. Edited by H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia: Department of Archaeology, University of Pennsylvania, 1906.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the ancient Near East and the Bible*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 26. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Psalms 73-150*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003.
- Clifford, James. "Looking for Bomma." *London Review of Books* (24 March 1994): 26-27.
- Cogan, Morton *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 19. Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Cogan, Mordechai and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings*. The Anchor Yale Bible 11. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Cole, Robert. *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalms 73-89)*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 307. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Collins, John J. "Mowinckel's *He That Cometh* Revisited." *Studia Theologica* 61 (2007): 3-20.
- Craigie, Peter C. "Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition." *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 143-151.
- Cross, Frank M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cross, Frank M. and David N. Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1997.

- Dalley, Stephanie. "Statues of Marduk and the Date of Enuma Eliš." *Altorientalische Forschungen* 24 (1997): 163-171.
- Dalley, Stephanie. "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II." *Iraq* 47 (1985): 31-48.
- Day, John. *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 265. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Davies, N. de Garis. *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna: Part IV Tombs of Parennefer, Tutu, and Ay*. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.: London, 1908.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *Die Psalmen*. 5th ed., Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1894.
- de Moor, Johannes Cornelias. *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium 91. Leuven Peeters, 1990.
- De Vaux, Roland, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961.
- Dietrich, M. "Das *Enūma eliš* als mythologischer Grndtext Für die Identität der Marduk-Religion Babylonien." *Forschungen zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte* 40 (2006): 135-163.
- Dietrich, Walter. "Gott als König: Zur Frage nach der theologischen und politischen Legitimität religiöser Begriffsbildung." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 77 (1980): 251-268.
- Dion, Paul E. *Hebrew Poetics: A Students Guide*. Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1988.
- Dixon, Robert. "Traveling in the West': The Writing of Amitav Ghosh." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 31 (1996): 3-24.
- Donner, Herbert. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzüge*. Altes Testament Deutsch Ergänzungsreihe 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *God at War: Power in the Exodus Tradition*. New York University: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Dubovský, Peter. *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and its Significance for 2 Kings 18-19*. Biblica et orientale 49. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.

- Dubovský, Peter. "Tiglath-pileser III's Campaigns in 734-732 B.C.: Historical Background of Isa 7; 2 Kgs 15-16 and 2 Chr 27-28." *Biblica* 87 (2006): 153-170.
- Durand, Jean-Marie. "Le mythologème du combat entre le dieu de l'orage et la mer en Mésopotamie." *Mari Annales de Recherches Interdisziplinaires* 7 (1993): 41-61.
- Dwivedi, Om P. ed., *The Fiction of Amitav Ghosh: An Assessment*. Jaipur, Rajasthan: Book Enclave, 2009.
- Eaton, John H. *The Psalms Come Alive: Capturing the Voice and Art of Israel's Songs*. Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1984.
- Eaton, John H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1986.
- Eaton, John H. *Psalms of the Way and the Kingdom: A Conference with Commentators*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 199. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Ehlich, Carl. *The Philistines in Transition: A History from ca. 1000-730 B.C.E.* Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Emelianov, Vladimir V. "On the Early History of *melammu*." Pages 1109-19 in *Proceedings of the Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale 53*. Edited by L. Kogan. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Emerton, John A. "New Light on Israelite Religion: the Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 2-20.
- Engnell, Ivan. *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1943; 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 1967.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "Jahwe als König." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46 (1928): 81-105.
- Elat, Moshe. "The Economic Relations of the Neo-Assyrian Empire with Egypt." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98 (1978): 20-34.
- Evans, Paul S. *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-Critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18-19*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 125. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Foster, Benjamin R. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. 3rd ed. Maryland: CDL Press, 2005.

- Fowler, Jeaneane. *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Frame, Grant. "My Neighbor's God: Aššur in Babylonia and Marduk in Assyria." *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Bulletin* 34 (1999): 5-22.
- Frahm, Eckart. "Counter-texts, Commentaries, and Adaptations: Politically Motivated Responses to the Babylonian Epic of Creation in Mesopotamia, the Biblical World, and Elsewhere." *Orient: Reports of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan* 45 (2010): 3-33.
- Freedman, David N. "Strophe and Meter in Exodus 15." Pages 163-203 in *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Meyers*. Edited by H. N. Bream, R. D. Heim and C. A. Moore. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1974.
- Freedman, David N. and C. F. Hyland. "Psalm 29: A Structural Analysis." *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 237-256.
- Freedman, David N. "Who is Like Thee Among the Gods? The Religion of Early Israel." Pages 315-335 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by P. D. Miller, P. D. Hanson, S. D. McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Gallagher, William R. "Assyrian deportation propaganda." *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 8 (1994): 57-65.
- Galter, Hannes D. "Looking Down the Tigris: The Interrelations Between Assyria and Babylonia." Pages 527-540 in *The Babylonian World*. Edited by G. Leick. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Garelli, Paul. "Importance et rôle des Araméens dans l'administration de l'empire assyrien." Pages 437-47 in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis I. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Edited by H. J. Nissen and J. Renge. Berlin: Reimer, 1982.
- Garelli, Paul. "The Achievement of Tiglath-Pileser III: Novelty or Continuity?" Pages 46-57 in *Ah Assyria . . . : Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor*. Edited by M. Cogan and I. Eph'al. Scripta Hierosolymitana 33. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991.
- Geertz, Clifford. "Review of Amitav Ghosh *In an Antique Land*." *The Australian* (August 25, 1993): 30.
- Gellner, Ernest "Concepts and Society." Pages 18-49 in *Rationality: Key Concepts in the Social Sciences*. Edited by Bryan R. Wilson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

- Gerstenberger, Erhard. " 'World Domination' in Yahweh Kingship Psalms: Down to the Roots of Globalizing Concepts and Strategies." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 23 (2001): 192-210.
- George, Andrew R. "The Tower of Babel: Archaeology, History and Cuneiform Texts." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 51 (2005-06): 75-95.
- Ghosh, Amitav. "Kinship in Relation to the Economic and Social Organization of an Egyptian Village Community." Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1981.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *In an Antique Land: History in the Guise of a Traveler's Tale*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Ghosh, Amitav. "The Slave of Ms H.6." *Subaltern Studies* 7 (1992): 159-220.
- Ghosh, Amitav. *Sea of Poppies*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.
- Gitin, Seymour. "Tel Miqne-Ekron in the 7th Century B.C.E.: The Impact of Economic Innovation and Foreign Cultural Influences on a Neo-Assyrian Vassal City-State." Pages 61-79 in *Recent Excavations in Israel: A View to the West*. Edited by S. Gitin. Archaeological Institute of America, Colloquia and Conference Papers 1. Dubuque, Iowa: Archaeological Institute of America, 1995.
- Giveon, Raphael. *Les bédouines Shosou des documents égyptiens*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Goedicke, Hans. "The Tetragram in Egyptian?" *Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities* 24 (1994): 24-27.
- Gogel, Sandra L. *A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources in Biblical Studies 23. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Gray, John. Review of, Aubrey R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 440-443.
- Gray, John. "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 268-285.
- Gray, John. "Royal Substitution in the ANE." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 57 (1955): 180-182.
- Gray, John. *The Legacy of Canaan: The Ras Shamra Texts and Their Relevance to the Old Testament*. *Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series* 5. Leiden: Brill, 1957; sec. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Gray, John. *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979.

- Grayson, Albert K. "Problematic Battle in Mesopotamian History." Pages 337-342 in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Assyriological Studies 16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Grayson, Albert K. *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*. TCS 5, Locust, 1975.
- Grayson, Albert, K. *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Part 1: From the Beginning to Ashur-reshai-ishi I*. Records of the Ancinet Near East 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1972.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *An Introduction to the Psalms: Genres of Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by J. D. Nogalski. GA: Mercer University Press, 1998. Translation of *Einleitung in die Psalmen: die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933.
- Hackett, Jo-Ann. *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Alla*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 31. Chico CA: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Hadley, Judith M. "The Khirbet el-Qom Inscription." *Vetus Testamentum* 37 (1987): 50-62.
- Hadley, Judith M. *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hamilton, Mark W. "The Past as Destiny: Historical Visions in Sam'al and Judah under Assyrian Hegemony." *Harvard Theological Review* 91 (1998): 215-50.
- Hallo, William W., ed. *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Vol. 1 of *The Context of Scripture*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Hawley, John C. *Amitav Ghosh: An Introduction*. New Dheli; Foundation Books, 2005.
- Handy, Lowell K. *Among the Host of Heaven*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Hendel, Ronald. *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History of the Hebrew Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hoftijzer, Jacob, and Gerrit van der Kooij, eds. *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla*. Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 19. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Holloway, Steven W. *Aššur is King! Aššur is King!: Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Holloway, Steven W. ed., *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 10. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

- Hooke, Samuel H., ed., *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Howard, David. "A Contextual Reading of Psalms 90-94." Pages 108-123 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J.C. McCann. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 159. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Howard, David M. *The Structure of Psalms 93-100*. Brown Judaic Studies 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Huehnergard, John. *A Grammar of Akkadian*. 2nd edition; Harvard Semitic Studies 45. Winona Lk: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Hurowitz, Victor A. "Isaiah's Unpure Lips and Their Purification in Light of Akkadian Sources." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60 (1989): 39-89
- Ibrahim, M. M. and Gerrit van der Kooij, "The Archaeology of Deir 'Allā Phase IX." Pages 16-29 in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*. Edited by J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Ingold, Timothy. "The Art of Translation in a Continuous World." Pages 210-30 in *Beyond Boundaries: Understanding, Translation and Anthropological Discourse*. Edited by G. Palisson. Oxford: Berg, 1994.
- Ishida, Tomoo. *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 142. New York: de Gruyter, 1977.
- Jackson, Kent P. "The Language of the Mesha Inscription." Pages 96-130 in *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Edited by A. Dearman. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasure of the Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen: Israel Begegnung mit dem kanaanäischen Mythos in den Jahwe-König-Psalmen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 141. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. "Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship: Divine Kingship and The Old Testament." *Expository Times* 62 (1951): 36-37.

- Johnson, Aubrey R. *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1955.
- Jordon, Shirley Ann. "Ethnographic Encounters: The Process of Cultural Translation, Language and Intercultural Communication." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 2 (2002): 96-110.
- Jotūn, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia biblica 27. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
- Keel, Othmar. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Kenner, Hubert J. "A Canonical Exegesis of the Eighth Psalm: YHWH's Maintenance of the Created Order Through Divine Reversal." PhD diss., Baylor University, 2010.
- Keel, Othmar and Christoph Uehlinger. "Jahwe und die Sonnengottheit von Jerusalem." Pages 296-306 in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*. Edited by W. Dietrich and M. A. Klopfenstein. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994.
- Keesing, Roger M. "Conventional Metaphors and Anthropological Metaphysics: The Problematic of Cultural Translation." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41 (1985): 201-217.
- Khair, Tabish. ed., *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Companion*. New Delhi: Pauls Press, 2003.
- King, Lawrence W. *The Annals of the Kings of Assyria*. Londres: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1902.
- Kloos, Carola. *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea: A Canaanite Tradition in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. Amsterdam: van Oorschot, 1986.
- Korpel, Marjo C.A. "Exegesis in the Work of Ilimiku of Ugarit." Pages 86-111 in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel: Papers read at the Tenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en Belgie held at Oxford, 1997*. Edited by J. C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Kraus, Hans J. *Psalmen I*. Biblischer Kommentar-Altes Testament; Neukirchen Kris Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- Kuhr, Amélie. *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000-330 bc*. 2 vols. London: Routledge 1994.
- Labat, René. *Le Poème Babylonien De La Création*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1935.

- Lambert, Wilfred G. "The Conflict on the Akitu House." *Iraq* 25 (1963): 189-90.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion." Pages 3-13 in *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek*. Edited by W. S McCullough. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1964.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "The Cosmology of Sumer and Babylon." Pages 42-65 in *Ancient Cosmologies*. Edited by C. Blacker and M. Loewe. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "Ninurta Mythology in the Babylonian Epic of Creation." Pages 55-60 in *Keilschriftliche Literature; Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Edited by K. Hecker and W. Sommerfeld. Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 6: Berlin, 1986.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "The Assyrian Recension of the Enuma Elish." Pages 77-79 in *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIXe Rencontre assyriologique internationale. Heidelberg, 6.-10. Juli 1992*. Edited by H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann. Heidelberg: Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient 6, 1997.
- Lambert, Wilfred G. "Mesopotamian Creation Stories." Pages 15-60 in *Imagining Creation. Institute of Jewish Studies in Judaica* 5. Edited by Markaham J. Geller and Mineke Schipper. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Landsberger, Benno and J.V. Kinner Wilson. "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Elish." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 20 (1961): 154-79.
- Lanfranchi, Giovanni B. "The Ideological and Political Impact of Assyria Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries BC." Pages 89-111 in *The Heirs of Assyria*. Edited by S. Aro and R. M. Whiting. Melammu Symposia 1. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Corpus Project, 2000.
- Larsen, Tord. "Action, Morality, and Cultural Translation." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 43 (1987): 1-28.
- Lemaire, André. "Les texts araméens de Deir 'Allā." *Syria* 54 (1977): 189-208.
- Lete, Gregorio del Olmo and Joaquín Sanmartín, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. 2 volumes. Handbook of Oriental Studies 67. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Leprohon, Ronald J. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Pharaonic Egypt." Pages 273-87 *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Vol 1. Edited by J. M. Sasson. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1995.

- Levine, Baruch A. "The Plaster Inscriptions from Deir 'Allā: General Interpretation." Pages 59-72 in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*. Edited by J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Levine, Baruch A. "'Ah Assyria? My Rage' (Isa 10:15): Biblical Monotheism as seen in an International Political Perspective." *Eretz-Israel* 27 (2003): 136-42.
- Levine, Baruch A. "Assyrian Ideology and Israelite Monotheism." *Iran* 67 (2005): 411-427.
- L'Heureux, Conrad E. *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba'al and Repha'im*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 21. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Lienhardt, Godfrey. "Modes of Thought." Pages 95-107 in *The Institutions of Primitive Society*. Edited by E. E. Evans-Pritchard et al., eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1954.
- Linssen Marc J.H., *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon: The Temple Ritual Texts as Evidence for Hellenistic Cult Practice*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Lipiński, Edward. "Yahweh *mālāk*." *Biblica* 44 (1963): 405-60.
- Lipiński, Edward. *La Royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël*. 2nd ed.; Paleis der Academiën: Brussels, 1968.
- Livingstone, Alasdair S. *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Luckenbill, Daniel D. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia: Volume I. Historical Records of Assyria from the Earliest Times to Sargon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Lunn, Nicholas P. *Word-Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry: Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics*. Great Britain: Paternoster Press, 2006.
- Machinist, Peter. "Literature as Politics: The Tukulti-Ninurta Epic and the Bible." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 455-482.
- Machinist, Peter. "The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I: A Study in Middle Assyrian Literature." PhD diss, Yale, New Haven, 1978.
- Machinist, Peter. "Assyria and its Image in First-Isaiah." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 103 (1983): 719-37.

- Machinist, Peter. "The Assyrians and their Babylonian Problem: Some Reflections," Pages 354-364 in *Jahrbuch des Wissenschaftskollegs zu Berlin*. Edited by P. Wapnewski, 1984/1985.
- Machinist, Peter. "Final Response: On the Study of the Ancients, Language, Writing and the State." Pages 291-300 in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Culture*. Edited by S. Sanders. Oriental Institute Studies 2. Chicago; University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Machinist, Peter. "Distinctiveness in Ancient Israel: An Essay." Pages 196-212 in *Ah Assyria . . . : Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor*. Edited by M. Cogan and I. Eph'al. Scripta Hierosolymitana 33. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991.
- Machinist, Peter. "Mesopotamian Imperialism and Israelite Religion: A Case Study from Second Isaiah." Pages 237-264 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel, and Their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Proceedings of the Centennial Symposium W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, May 29-31, 2000. Edited by W. G. Dever and S. Gitin. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Majeed, Javed. "Amitav Ghosh's *In an Antique Land*: The Ethnographer-Historian and the Limits of Irony." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 30:2 (1995): 45-55.
- Malul, Meir. *The Comparative Method in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Legal Studies*. Germany: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1990.
- Maul, Stefan. "The Ancient Middle Eastern Capital City: Reflection and Navel of the World," Translated by Thomas Lampert. Translation of "Die altorientalische Hauptstadt: Abbild und Nabel der Welt," Pages 109-124 in *Die Orientalische Stadt: kontinuitat*. Internationale Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft; 9-10. Mai 1996 in Halle/Saale. Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1997.
<http://prelectur.stanford.edu/lecturers/maul/ancientcapitals.html>
- May, Herbert G. "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55 (1937): 277-78.
- Mayes, Andrew D. H. *Deuteronomy*. New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1979.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry." Pages 74-89 in *Creation in the Old Testament*. Edited by B. W. Anderson. Issues in Religion and Theology 6. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 393-406.

- McCarter, P. Kyle. "The Balaam Texts from Deir 'Allā: The First Combination." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 239 (1980): 49-60.
- McKay, John W. *Religion in Judah under the Assyrians*. Studies in Biblical Theology Series 26. London: SCM Press, 1973.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Coniectanea biblica Old Testament Series 18. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1982.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. "YHWH Sabaoth, the Heavenly King on the Earthly Throne." Pages 109-38 in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*. Edited by T. Ishida. Winona Lake, Indiana; Eisenbrauns, 1982.
- Mettinger, Tryggve. "The Elusive Essence: YHWH El and Baal and the Distinctiveness of Israelite Faith." Pages 393-417 in *Die Hebraische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte*. Fs. R Rendtorff. Edited E. Blum, C. Macholz and E.W. Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990.
- Millard, Alan R. "The Practice of Writing in Ancient Israel." *Biblical Archaeologist* A 35 (1972): 98-111
- Millard, Alan R. "In Praise of Ancient Scribes." *Biblical Archaeologist* (1982): 143-53.
- Miller, John W. "God as Father in the Bible and the Father Image in Several Ancient Near Eastern Myths: A Comparison." *Studies in Religion* 14.3 (1985): 349-350.
- Miller, Patrick D. *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1973.
- Miller, Patrick D. "Israelite Religion." Pages 220-222 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by D.A. Knight and G.M. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Mondal, Anshuman A. *Amitav Ghosh: Contemporary World Writers*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
- Moore, Anne. *Moving Beyond Symbol and Myth: Understanding the Kingship of God of the Hebrew Bible Through Metaphor*. Studies in Biblical Literature 99. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Psalmestudier II: Buch I-II*. Amsterdam: Verlag P. Schippers, 1922.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*. Translated by D.R. Ap-Thomas. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 2004.

- Morrow, William S. "Cuneiform Literacy and Deuteronomic Composition." *Bibliotheca Oriental* 62 (2005): 204-213.
- Morrow, William S. "Resistance and Hybridity in Late Bronze Age Canaan." *Revue Biblique* 115 (2008): 321-39.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against Tyre and Israel (734-732 B.C.E.)." *Tel Aviv* 22 (1995): 268-78.
- Na'aman, Nadav. "Tiglath-pileser III's campaigns against Tyre and Israel (734-732 B.C.E.)." Pages 56-67 in *Ancient Israel and its neighbors: Interaction and Counteraction*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Nelson, Richard D. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Noth, Martin. *Numbers*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968.
- O'Connor, Michael P. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1980.
- Oded, Bustenay. *Mass Deportations and Deportees in the Neo Assyrian Empire*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1979.
- Oldenburg, Ulf. *The Conflict Between El and Baal in Canaanite Religion*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Olmsted, Albert T. *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria, 722-705 B.C.* New York: H. Holt, 1908.
- Olmstedt, Albert T. *History of Assyria*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.
- Oshima, Takayoshi. "The Babylonian God Marduk." Pages 348-360 in *The Babylonian World*. Edited by G. Leick. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Pallis, Svend A. *The Babylonian Akitu Festival*. Historisk-filologiske Meddeleser 12. Copenhagen: Høst & Søn, 1926.
- Pardee, Dennis. "On Psalm 29: Structure and Meaning." Pages 153-181 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by P. Flint and P. D. Miller. Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series 99. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

- Pardee, Dennis and Nancy Pardee, "Gods of Glory Ought to Thunder: The Canaanite Matrix of Psalm 29." Pages 115-124 in *Psalm 29 through Time and Tradition*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Edited by L. K. Handy. Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2009.
- Parpola, Simo. "Assyrians after Assyria." *Journal of the Assyrian Academic Society* 12 (2000): 1-16.
- Parpola, Simo. "Assyrian Identify in Ancient Times and Today" No Pages. Online: http://www.nineveh.com/parpola_eng.pdf.
- Parpola, Simo. "Assyria's Expansion in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BCE and Its Long Term Repercussions in the West." Pages 99-111 in *Symbiosis, Symbolism, and the Power of the Past: Canaan, Ancient Israel and their Neighbors from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palaestina*. Edited by W. G. Dever and S. Gitin. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Parker, Simon B. ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Society of Biblical Literature Writings of the Ancient World 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Parker, Bradley. *The Mechanics of Empire: The Northern Frontier of Assyria as a Case Study in Imperial Dynamics*. Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2001.
- Petersen, Allan R. *The Royal God: Enthronement Festivals in Ancient Israel and Ugarit*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 259. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Pietersma, Albert, ed. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pongratz-Leisten, Beate. "Lying King and False Prophet: the Intercultural Transfer of a Rhetorical Device within Ancient Near Eastern Ideologies." Pages 215-243 in *Ideologies and Intercultural Phenomena*. Edited by A. Panaino and G. Pettinato. Melammu Symposia III. Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Chicago, USA, October 27-31, 2000. Milano: Universita di Bologna & Isiao, 2002.
- Pope, Marvin *El in Ugaritic Texts*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 2. Leiden: Brill, 1955.
- Porter, J.R. *Moses and Monarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.
- Porter, Barbara N. "'For the Astonishment of All Enemies': Assyrian Propaganda and Its Audiences in the Reigns of Ashurnasirpal II and Esarhaddon." *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 35 (2000): 7-18.

- Postgate, J. Nicolas. *Taxation and Conscription in the Assyrian Empire*. Studia Pohl: Series Maior 3. Roma: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1974.
- Postgate, J. Nicolas. *Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1976.
- Postgate, J. Nicholas. *The Archive of Urad-Šerūa and His Family: A Middle Assyrian Household in Government Service*. Pubblicazioni del Progetto ‘Analisi elettronica del cuneiforme’. Corpus Medio-Assiro. Roma: Roberto Denicola Editore, 1988.
- Prinsloo, Willem S. “Psalm 95: If Only You Will Listen to His Voice!,” Pages 393-410 in *The Bible in Human Society: A Festschrift in Honor of J. Rogerson*. Edited by M.D. Carroll, D.J. Clines, P. R. Davies. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 200. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Propp, William C. *Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Radner, Karen. “Money in the Neo-Assyrian Empire.” Pages 127-57 in *Trade and Finance in Ancient Mesopotamia*. MOS Studies 1. Edited by J. G. Dercksen. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Psalmi cum Odis*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Redford, Donald B. *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Reiner, Erica. *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*. Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 11. Graz: AfO, 1958.
- Richardson, M. E. J. *A Comprehensive Grammar to Hammurabi’s Stele*. New Jersey: Georgias Press, 2008.
- Richter, Sandra L. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 318. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Roberts, Jimmy Jack McBee. “Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire.” Pages 93-108 in *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays*. Edited by T. Ishida. Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1982.
- Roberts, Jimmy Jack McBee. “The Religio-Political Setting of Psalm 47.” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1976): 129-132.

- Roberts, Jimmy Jack McBee. "Mowinckel's Enthronement Festival." Pages 97-115 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by P. W. Flint and P. D. Miller. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Roberts, Jimmy Jack McBee. "God's Imperial Reign According to the Psalter." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 23 (2001): 211-221.
- Robertson, David A. *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*. Studies in Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 3. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Russell, Brian D. *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21*. Studies in Biblical Literature 101. New York: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sanders, Seth. *The Invention of Hebrew*. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Schley, Donald G. *Shiloh: A Biblical City in Tradition and History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 63. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book: The Textualization of Ancient Israel*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Schneider, Thomas. "The First Documented Occurrence of the God Yahweh? (Book of the Dead Princeton 'Roll 5')." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 7 (2008): 113-20.
- Schökel, Lois A. *A Manuel of Hebrew Poetics*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.
- Schwemer, Daniel. "The Storm-Gods of the Ancient Near East: Part II." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Religion* 8.1 (2008): 11-12.
- Seri, Andrea. "The fifty names of Marduk in Enuma elis." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126 (2006): 507-519.
- Shenkel, James D. "An Interpretation of Psalm 93:5." *Biblica* 56 (1965): 401-416.
- Siddall, Luis Robert. "Tiglath-pileser III's Aid to Ahaz: A New Look at the Problems of the Biblical Accounts in Light of Assyrian Sources." *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 46 (2009): 93-106.

- Silver, Morris. "The Mythical Conflict Between Osiris and Seth and Egypt's Trade with Byblos During the Old Kingdom." Pages 193-96 in *Ancient Economy in Mythology: East and West*. Edited by Morris Silver. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1991.
- Silverman, David P. "Divinity and Deities in Ancient Egypt." Pages 7-87 in *Religion in Ancient Egypt*. Edited by B. E. Shafer; Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Sivan, Daniel. *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Skaggs, Henry W. F. (ed.) *The Nimrud Letters, 1952*. Cuneiform Texts From Nimrud 5. Great Britain: Cromwell Press, 2001.
- Smelik, Klaas A. D. "King Mesha's Inscription: Between History and Fiction." Pages 61-63 in *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israel and Moabite Historiography*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume I: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU 1.1-1.2*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 55. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 239. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Memoirs of God: History, Memory, and the Experience of the Divine in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Smith, Mark. S. *The Ritual and Myths of the Feast of the Goodly Gods of KTU/CAT 1.23: Royal Constructions of Opposition, Intersection, Integration and Domination*. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study 51. Society of Biblical Literature: Atlanta, 2006.
- Smith, Mark S. and Wayne Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle Volume II: Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary of KTU/CAT 1.3-1.4*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 114. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Smith, Mark S. *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 57. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 2010.

- Smith, Mark S. "God in Translation: Cross Cultural Recognition of Divinity in Ancient Israel." Pages 241-270 in *Reconsidering the Concept of Revolutionary Monotheism*. Edited by B. Pongratz-Leisten. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Smith, Mark S. "God in Israel's Bible: Divinity between the World and Israel, between the Old and the New" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (2012): forthcoming.
- Sparks, Kenton L. "Enuma Elish and Priestly Mimesis: Elite Emulation in Nascent Judaism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 625-648.
- Sommerfeld, Walter von. *Der Aufstieg Marduks: die Stellung Marduks in der Babylonischen Religion des zweiten Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Neukirchener Verlag: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1982.
- Soueif, A. "Review of *In an Antique Land*," *Times Literary Supplement* 15 January 1993.
- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Spieckerman, Hermann. *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidzeit*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 129. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Srivastava, Neelam. "Amitav Ghosh's Ethnographic Fictions: Intertextual Links between *In an Antique Land* and His Doctoral Thesis." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* (2001): 45-64.
- Steiner, Rudolf C. "*Dāt and 'ên*: Two Verbs Masquerading as Nouns in Moses' Blessing (Deuteronomy 33:2, 28)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 693-98.
- Tadmor, Hayim "Azriyau of Yaudi." Pages 232-271 in *Studies in the Bible*. Edited by C. Rabin. Scripta Hierosolymitana 8. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1961.
- Tadmor, Hayim. "The Aramaization of Assyria: Aspects of Western Impact." Pages 449-70 in *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn: Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im Alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis I. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Edited by H. J. Nissen and J. Renge. Berlin: Reimer, 1982.
- Tanner, Beth LaNeel. *The Book of Psalms Through the Lens of Intertextuality*. Studies in Biblical Literature 26. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Tate, Marvin, *Psalms 51-100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.

- Talon, Philippe. *The Standard Babylonian Creation Myth: Enūma Eliš*. State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts 4. Helsinki: Neo Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2005.
- Taylor, Glen J. *Yahweh and the Sun: Biblical and Archeological Evidence for Sun Worship in Ancient Israel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 111. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Taylor, Glen J. "The Two Earliest Known Representations of Yahweh," Pages 557-66 in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. Edited by ed. L. Eslinger and J. G. Taylor. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 67. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.
- Taylor, Glen J. "A Response to Steve A. Wiggins 'Yahweh: The God of the Sun'." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (1996): 107-119.
- te Velde, Herman. *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of His Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion*. Probleme der Ägyptologie. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Tigay, Jeffery H. *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in Light of Hebrew Inscriptions*. Harvard Semitic Studies 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Tigay, Jeffery H. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2002.
- Tiwari, Shubha. *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Study*. New Dehli: Atlantic Publishers, 2003.
- Uehlinger, Christoph "Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals, Iconography and Syro-Palestinian Religions of the Iron Age II: Some Afterthoughts and Conclusions." Pages 257-89 in *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals*. Edited by B. Sass and C. Uehlinger. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 125. Freiburg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Ulrich, Eugene. and Frank Moore Cross, et al. *Qumran Cave 4, IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert XIV. Oxford: Claredon, 1995.
- van der Kooij, Gerrit. "Book and Script at Deir 'Allā." Pages 239-262 in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*. Edited by J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- van der Toorn, Karl., "Yahweh" Pages 911-12 in *The Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P. Willem van der Horst. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1999.

- van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Vanstiphout, H.L.J. "Enuma Elish as a Systematic Creed: An Essay." *Orientalia Lovaninesia Periodica* 23 (1992): 37-61.
- Vogelzang, M.E. *BIN ŠAR DADMĒ: Edition and Analysis of the Akkadian Anzu Poem*. Groningen: Styx Publications, 1988.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael P. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wasserman, Nathan *Style and Form in Old Babylonian Literary Texts*. Cuneiform Monographs 27. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Watson, Wilfred G. E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to its Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Watts, James D.W. "Yahweh Malak Psalms." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 21 (1965): 341-348.
- Wente, Edward F. (Trans) "The Contendings of Horus and Seth" in *The Literature of Ancient Egypt: An Anthology of Stories, Instructions, and Poetry*. Edited by William K. Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. Anchor Bible 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Weippert, Manfred. "The Balaam Texts from Deir 'Allā and the Study of the Old Testament," Pages 151-184 in *The Balaam Text from Deir 'Allā Re-Evaluated: Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Leiden, 21-24 August 1989*. Edited by J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Wettersten, John. "Ernest Gellner: A Wittgensteinian Rationalist." Pages 497-520 in *The Social Philosophy of Ernest Gellner*. Edited by J. A. Hall and I. C. Jarvie. Poznan Studies in the Philosophy of Sciences and the Humanities 48. Atlanta: Rodophi, 1996.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Protest against Imperialism in Ancient Israelite Prophecy." Pages 169-82 in *The Origin and Diversity of Axial Age Civilizations*. Edited by S.N. Eisenstadat. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Wevers, John W. ed., *Deuteronomium*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

- Wilson, Gerald. "Understanding the Purposeful Arrangement of Psalms in the Psalter: Pitfalls and Promise," Pages 42-51 in *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Edited by J. Clinton McCann. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 159. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Wyatt, Nicholas. "The Titles of the Ugaritic Storm-God." *Ugarit Forschungen* (1992): 404.
- Yamada, Shigeo. "Tukulti-Ninurta I's Rule over Babylonia and its Aftermath." *Orient* 38 (2003): 153-77.
- Young, Ian., Robert Rezetko, Martin Ehrensivärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. London: Equinox, 2009.
- Young, Ian. "Biblical Texts Cannot be dated Linguistically." *Hebrew Studies* (2005): 341-351.
- Zenger, Erich., and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld, *Psalms 2: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Zenger, Erich. "Theophanien des Königsgottes JHWH: Transformationen von Psalm 29 im Psalter." Pages 163-190 in *Ritual und Poesie: Formen und Orte religiöser Dichtung im Alten Orient*. Edited by E. Zenger. Herders Biblische Studien 18. Fribourg: Herder, 2003.